

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. August 1905.

CONFIDENTIAL.

(8482.)



FO 406/21

PART II.

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

AFFAIRS OF ARABIA.

March and April 1905.

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. August 1905.

CONFIDENTIAL.

(8482.)

PART II.

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

AFFAIRS OF ARABIA.

March and April 1905.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
1	India Office	Feb. 28, 1905	Affairs in Arabia and Persian Gulf. Transmits inclosures in letter from Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, of 26th January ..	1
2	" "	28,	French Vice-Consul at Muscat. Transmits inclosure in letter from Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, of 2nd February ..	5
3	To Mr. Townley ..	70	Mar. 1,	Conduct of British officers near Koweit. Facts of the case ..	5
4	India Office	2,	Proposed Agreement with Sheikh of El Katr. Transmits telegram to Viceroy. His Majesty's Government unwilling to raise any question affecting <i>status quo</i> ..	6
4A	" "	2,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 28th February. Decided to send balance of 3rd Battalion Rifle Brigade ..	6*
4B	" "	3,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice of 3rd March. Would a visit to Turkish Commissioner at Turba in "Perseus" hasten settlement? He might induce Commissioner to telegraph to Constantinople urging acceptance of demands in No. 77, Part I ..	6*
5	Sir N. O'Connor ..	47 Tel.	3,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 4 B. Has approved action of Mr. Fitzmaurice ..	6
6	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	19 Tel.	3,	Aden delimitation. What reply to suggestion in No. 4 B? ..	7
7	To Admiralty	3,	Aden delimitation. Transmits Nos. 4 B and 5, urging instructions to be sent to Commander of His Majesty's ship "Perseus" in sense suggested ..	7
8	Mr. Townley ..	130 Confidential	Feb. 28,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 103, Part I. State of Yemen gives Porte great concern ..	7
9	Sir N. O'Connor ..	45 Tel.	Mar. 6,	Aden delimitation. Does Lord Lansdowne approve omission of fourth condition in No. 77, Part I? ..	8
10	Sir F. Bertie ..	87	6,	Muscat arbitration. Transmits note from M. Delcassé on subject of selection of an Umpire ..	8
11	Admiralty Confidential	4,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 7. Commander of "Perseus" instructed to make necessary arrangements ..	9
12	India Office	7,	Affairs at Bahrein. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 6th March. Sheikh so far complied with demands as to render recommencement of hostilities unnecessary ..	9
12*	" "	7,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice of 7th March. Instructions sent to "Perseus" contingent on state of monsoon ..	9*
13	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	21 Tel.	7,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 9. Point 4 in No. 77, Part I, may be omitted ..	10

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

iii

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
14	India Office	Mar. 7, 1905	Muscat arbitration. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 7th March. Refers to No. 104, Part I. As regards our Counter-Case, communication will be made direct by Resident in Persian Gulf ..	10
15	" "	8,	Affairs of South-West Arabia. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 7th March. Question of reception of Kaimakam and refugees from Dthala ..	10
16	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	80	8,	Maltreatment of German merchant at Aha. Commanders of two British ships alleged to have had culprits beaten and fined ..	11
17	" " ..	88	8,	Anchoring of two British ships off Bussorah. Alleged by Porte to be an infringement on their rights, as locality in Sandjak of Nejd ..	11
18	India Office	8,	Muscat arbitration. Refers to Nos. 75 and 104, Part I. Same as No. 14 ..	12
19	" "	9,	Yemen insurrection. Transmits No. 15. Mr. Brodrick proposes to approve instructions ..	12
20	Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley	7	Feb. 18,	Affairs of Nejd and Koweit. Transmits summary of information ..	13
21	Sir E. Egerton ..	34	Mar. 8,	Muscat arbitration. Transmits note requesting Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs to request King of Italy to nominate an Umpire ..	14
22	Sir N. O'Connor ..	50 Tel.	11,	Aden delimitation. Delimitation of southern frontier to Sheikh Mirad completed. Yaffai Canton to be delimited in due course ..	15
23	" " ..	139	4,	Aden delimitation. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's Consul-General, Damascus, reporting arrival and departure of further Turkish troops for service in Yemen ..	15
24	" " ..	140	4,	Yemen insurrection. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's Consul, Jerusalem, reporting departure of five more battalions of Redifs for Akaba ..	16
25	" " ..	154	7,	Yemen insurrection. Three Turkish transports leaving Jeddah for Akaba with 6,000 troops ..	17
26	" " ..	157	8,	Turkish expedition into Nejd. Transmits despatch from Military Attaché ..	17
27	" " ..	158	8,	Yemen rebellion. Transmits despatch from Military Attaché. Reports interview with War Minister ..	19
28	India Office	13,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice. Reports visit to Turkish Commissioner at Turba. Purport of telegram sent by latter to Porte ..	20
29	Sir N. O'Connor ..	51 Tel.	13,	Aden delimitation. Presence of "Perseus" for a few days near Turba would assist settlement ..	20
30	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	24 Tel.	18,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 22. Approves acceptance of arrangement ..	20
30*	To India Office	12,	French Vice-Consul at Muscat. Refers to No. 2. His Majesty's Government no right to refuse French Vice-Consul facilities for touring which they would claim as a matter of course ..	20*

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
31	India Office	Mar. 14, 1905	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice of March 14. Only place for "Perseus" near Turba would be Sheikh Said while monsoon lasts ..	21
32	Sir N. O'Connor ..	52 Tel.	14,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 30. Undesirable for Turkish Ambassador to know that proposals have been approved ..	21
33	" ..	53 Tel.	14,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 29. Copies of instructions sent to Yemen authorities for southern and north-eastern frontier satisfactory. Unnecessary to detain "Perseus" ..	21
34	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	25 Tel.	14,	Yemen insurrection. Refers to No. 113, Part I. Kaimakam of Kataba still at Kataba on 28th February. Resident instructed to afford him and other refugees good reception ..	22
35	To Admiralty	14,	Aden delimitation. Transmits Nos. 29 and 32. Requesting "Perseus" may be given necessary orders to remain ..	22
36	India Office	15,	Muscat arbitration. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 14th March. Lorimer instructed to report at earliest possible date ..	22
37	"	15,	Affairs of South-West Arabia. Transmits telegram to Viceroy of 13th March. Refers to No. 15. His Majesty's Government concurs in proposals as to refugees ..	23
38	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	26 Tel.	15,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 33. Congratulates him on success of negotiations. Admiralty informed that orders to "Perseus" may be cancelled ..	23
39	To M. Cambon	15,	Muscat arbitration. Refers to No. 75, Part I. His Majesty's Government can prove that Sultan of Muscat has elected to commit his cause to them of his own free will. Compromis signed on 13th October, 1904, indicates that His Highness is party primarily interested ..	23
40	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	89	15,	Erection of building at Bahrein by British officers. Building erected on mainland opposite Menama—territory forming part of Turkish Empire ..	24
41	To Sir F. Bertie ..	117A	15,	Muscat arbitration. Chief Justice Melville Fuller being unacquainted with French language, M. Delcassé agrees to use of English and French languages concurrently ..	24
42	To India Office	15,	Yemen insurrection. Refers to No. 19. Lord Lansdowne concurs in approving instructions to Resident ..	24
43	To Admiralty	15,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 35. Transmits No. 33. Orders to "Perseus" may be suspended ..	25
44	India Office	15,	Bahrein Customs. Transmits inclosures in Foreign Secretary's, Calcutta, letter of 9th February ..	25
44*	Sir A. Hardinge ..	33 Tel.	16,	Status of Koweit Arabs in Persia. Refers to Nos. 79 and 111, Part I. Instructions given to Customs officials due to orders issued by Mushir-ed-Dowleh. M. Naus promises to submit proposal to the Shah that Koweit subjects should be treated on same lines as Afghans in Persia ..	25*

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
45	India Office	Mar. 17, 1905	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice of 17th March. Telegraphic correspondence with Sir N. O'Connor respecting Mudariba-Sheikh Mirad section ..	28
46	Sir N. O'Connor ..	159	18,	Ibn Saoud's father. Vali proposed to Sheikh establishment of Ottoman troops, a post and a sanitary office should be established in Koweit. Also wrote to Ibn Saoud's father telling him to submit to Mushir ..	28
47	Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley	8 Confidential	Feb. 24,	Affairs of Nejd and Koweit. Further information respecting ..	29
48	To India Office	Mar. 18,	Koweit. Political Agent. Refers to No. 109, Part I. Inference in paragraph 3 of No. 109, Part I, as to withdrawal of Captain Knox incorrect. No objection to suggestions of Government of India for temporary withdrawal of Captain Knox ..	31
49	Sir N. O'Connor ..	165	14,	Yemen insurrection. Transmits despatch from Military Attaché reporting further reinforcements for Yemen from Syria ..	31
50	" ..	166	14,	Transmits despatch from Military Attaché, forwarding distribution table of 6th Bagdad Corps and list of Arab tribes in Bagdad Vilayet ..	32
51	" ..	168	14,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 33. Transmits copies of instructions sent to Yemen authorities, with observations ..	34
52	" ..	170	14,	Yemen insurrection. Transmits Memorandum by Military Attaché giving summary of events ..	36
53	India Office	20,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice of 20th March. Turkish Commissioner instructed to proceed with delimitation down to Sheikh Mirad ..	38
54	"	20,	Muscat arbitration. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 20th March. Refers to No. 36. Lowatayas are Khorassan emigrants from Sind ..	39
55	Sir N. O'Connor ..	55 Tel.	20,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 51. Telegram sent to Mr. Fitzmaurice. Turkish Minister of War instructed to authorize insertion of our claim to four places on north-east boundary in <i>procès-verbal</i> by Turkish Commissioner ..	39
56	India Office	21,	Yemen insurrection. Transmits telegram from Resident of 20th March. Imam reported to have captured Sanaa and Ibb and to be approaching Kataba ..	40
57	"	21,	Bahrein affairs. Refers to No. 12. Ultimatum presented 24th February. Force not resorted to as Sheikh agreed to our demands ..	40
58	Sir N. O'Connor ..	56 Tel.	21,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 55. We cannot ask Porte to do more than record our claim to four places ..	40
59	To India Office	21,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 33. Transmits No. 51. Draws attention to last paragraph respecting escort for Mr. Fitzmaurice ..	41
60	"	21,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 59. Transmits No. 55. Proposes to authorize Sir N. O'Connor to instruct Mr. Fitzmaurice to sign <i>procès-verbal</i> ..	41

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
61	India Office	Mar. 22, 1905	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice of 21st March. Recognition of Aulaki as British and of three out of the four places will be secured if Grand Vizier authorizes Turkish Commissioner to effect settlement of north-east boundary	41
62	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	29 Tel.	22,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 55. His Majesty's Government approve telegram to Mr. Fitzmaurice	42
63	To M. Cambon	22,	Muscat arbitration. Refers to No. 41. His Majesty's Government accept suggestion of use of English and French languages concurrently	42
64	India Office	22,	Koweit affairs. Transmits inclosures in letter from Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, of 23rd February	42
65	" "	22,	Arms and ammunition for Koweit. Transmits inclosures in letter from Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, of 23rd February relative to refusal of His Majesty's Consul at Muscat to authorize British India Steam Navigation Company to embark	48
66	" "	22,	Political Agent at Koweit. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 22nd March. Proposes that when Mr. Lorimer takes leave Captain Knox should officiate temporarily at Ahwaz	49
67	To India Office	23,	Muscat customs. Refers to Nos. 90 and 99, Part I. Undesirable that His Majesty's Government should at present initiate any change in internal administration. Proposes arrangement of less far-reaching character	50
68	India Office	22,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 60. Concurs in proposal	50
69	" "	23,	French Vice-Consul at Muscat. Transmits telegram to Viceroy of 22nd March. Refers to No. 30*. His Majesty's Consul at Muscat should be careful about intervening between French Consul and Sultan without orders	50
70	" "	24,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice of 24th March. Turkish Commissioner requests authority to recognize as British districts mentioned by Mr. Fitzmaurice	51
71	Sir N. O'Connor ..	58 Tel.	25,	Aden delimitation. Text of telegram to Mr. Fitzmaurice. In list of nine cantons of 1873 and of 1903 Aulaki included	51
72	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	95	25,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 51. Approves action	52
73	Sir N. O'Connor ..	178	21,	Yemen insurrection. Refers to No. 52. Rumoured capture of Sanaa unconfirmed. Porte continues to send reinforcements	52
74	" "	179	21,	Yemen insurrection. Refers to No. 52. Porte determined to buy over Sheikhs, and to remedy various abuses in taxes	53
75	" "	187	21,	Aden delimitation. Transmits paraphrase of telegraphic communication with Mr. Fitzmaurice	53

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
76	India Office	Mar. 27, 1905	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram to Viceroy of 15th March. Sir N. O'Connor reports satisfactory arrangement made in regard to southern frontier	54
77	" "	27,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram to Viceroy of 23rd March. Instructions in conformity with our demands for demarcation of Subaihi frontier from Mudariba to Mirad received by Yemen authorities	55
78	" "	27,	Muscat arbitration. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 27th March. Refers to No. 38. Government of India deprecate defining Sultan's territories. Question of independence of coast round Musandim Promontory	55
79	" "	27,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice of 27th March. Clause respecting non-alienation of "territory adjoining Sheikh Murad boundary line" to be inserted in <i>procès-verbal</i> . Signature of <i>procès-verbal</i> in above sense useless owing to vagueness of term	56
80	" "	28,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 27th March. All territory up to coast as far north as Kudam should be included in pledge to be given by Porte	56
81	Sir H. Howard ..	49	28,	Muscat arbitration. Note from M. de Ruysenaers communicating Mr. Justice Fuller's reply respecting delay in selecting Umpire	57
82	M. Cambon	27,	Muscat arbitration. Omission of name of Sultan of Muscat from documents to be presented to Hague Tribunal. Refers to No. 39	58
83	India Office	29,	Political Agent at Koweit. Temporary withdrawal of. Proposes to approve course suggested by Viceroy. Refers to No. 66	58
84	" "	29,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 80. Suggests calling Sir N. O'Connor's attention to Viceroy's suggestion	58
85	" "	29,	Building on mainland opposite Bahrein. Refers to No. 40. Indian Government asked to report	59
86	Sir N. O'Connor ..	189	27,	Yemen. Latest reports received from Vice-Consul at Hodeidah. Sanaa about to be relieved. 35,000 Turkish troops in Yemen	59
87	" "	190	27,	Nejd expedition. Bulk of Turkish forces left at Wakiab. Ibn Saoud's father received 58 liras per month from Porte up to 1903	60
88	India Office	31,	Muscat Customs. Transmits telegram to Viceroy of 28th March. Preferable to defer questions raised till after conclusion of Hague arbitration. Refers to No. 67	60
89	" "	31,	Muscat arbitration. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 30th March. List of dhow owners furnished by French Consul, and refused by Sultan	61
90	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	32 Tel.	31,	Aden. Refers to No. 84. Desirability of avoiding ambiguity	61
91	Sir N. O'Connor ..	60 Tel.	Apr. 1,	Yemen. Sanaa relieved after severe fighting	61

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
92	Sir N. O'Connor ..	61 Tel.	Apr. 1, 1905	Aden. Refers to No. 90. Written communication from Porte respecting ..	62
93	" ..	198	Mar. 28,	Yemen. Authorities at Beyrout ordered to collect seven battalions of reserves ..	62
94	" ..	200 Confidential	29,	Vali of Bussorah and Bahrein and Koweit. Refers to No. 46. Mr. Monahan's conversation with Vali. Eight Turkish soldiers on Buhian Island ..	62
95	India Office	Apr. 3,	Musandim flagstaffs. Telegram to Viceroy informing him of decision of Defence Committee ..	63
96	Admiralty Confidential	1,	Bahrein. Letter from Rear-Admiral. Proceedings of "Fox" and "Sphinx." Sheikh Ali's movable property seized and dhow burnt ..	63
97	India Office	3,	Koweit. Sheikh Mubarak warned against assisting Ibn Saoud. Despatch from Major Cox ..	69
98	"	3,	Muscat arbitration. Despatch from Major Cox. Suggests using in Counter-Case communication from Sultan respecting Soori flagholders. Observations on French Case ..	70
99	"	4,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice to Sir N. O'Connor. Turkish Commander authorized to recognize Aulaki as one of the nine cantons ..	73
100	Sir N. O'Connor ..	64 Tel.	4,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 99. Turkish Commissioner's compromise seems advantageous ..	73
101	To India Office	4,	Political Agent at Koweit. Concurs in withdrawal of. Refers to No. 83 ..	73
102	India Office	5,	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 4th April. Mr. Fitzmaurice advocates erecting pillars at Sheikh Said only ..	74
103	"	5,	Deportation of certain Arabs from Koweit. Sheikh's representations respecting ..	74
104	" (B)		Loan to Sheikh of Koweit. Bill for repayment of ..	77
105	" (C)	5,	Bussorah Agent of Sheikh of Koweit. Efforts to obtain release of unsuccessful ..	78
106	"	5,	Application of native of Bahrein for passport to proceed on pilgrimage to Kerbela. Application refused. Transmits correspondence from India ..	78
107	Sir N. O'Connor ..	203	2,	Aden. Non-alienation of territory. Refers to No. 92. Note from Porte respecting ..	80
108	" ..	207	4,	Troops for Yemen. Despatch from Colonel Maunsell respecting eight Redif battalions sent from Jerusalem ..	81
109	" ..	213	4,	Aden. Transmits telegrams to Mr. Fitzmaurice respecting signature of <i>procès-verbal</i> and map ..	82
110	" ..	214	4,	Yemen. Relief of Sanaa on 28th March. Kataba besieged by insurgents ..	83

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
110*	Sir N. O'Connor ..	223	Apr. 4, 1905	Aden. Question of sending troops into nine cantons, and non-alienation clause. Successful efforts for settlement of questions ..	83
111	India Office	7,	Aden. Erection of two pillars at Sheikh Said (see No. 102). Mr. Brodrick proposes to approve ..	84
112	"	8,	Piracy near Katif. Reports from Bushire and Bussorah. Local Turkish authorities taking no steps to arrest ..	84
113	"	11,	Bubian Island. Refers to No. 94. Suggests raising question of retention of Turkish military post on ..	85
114	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	114	11,	Bubian Island. Refers to No. 94. Is moment opportune for representations respecting? ..	87
115	India Office	11,	Quarantine in Persian Gulf. Alleged discrimination by Turks at Bussorah against Koweit ships ..	87
116	"	11,	Nejd. Extracts from diaries of Persian Gulf Political Residency respecting affairs in ..	88
117	"	12,	Attack on Bahrein boats by Behaih section of Marrah tribe. Sheikh Isa's attitude ..	90
118	"	12,	Messrs. Gabriel and Lorimer. Have left Bahrein for India. Despatch from Bushire respecting Turkish complaints against action of Gazetteer party ..	91
119	"	12,	Koweit dhow wrecked on Hormuz Island. Koweit subject accused of wounding Persian negro ..	92
120	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	40 Tel.	12,	Aden. Refers to No. 111. Any objection to erection of two pillars at Sheikh Said ..	93
121	Sir N. O'Connor ..	66 Tel.	13,	Aden. Refers to No. 120. No objection ..	93
122	To M. Cambon	13,	Muscat arbitration. Refers to No. 82. Passage omitted at his Excellency's request provided for reference to arbitration of any questions desired by Sultan, and did not preclude Tribunal from taking cognizance of Sultan's views ..	93
123	To India Office	13,	Aden. Pillars at Sheikh Said. Refers to No. 121. No objection to ..	94
124	"	15,	Aden. Transmits No. 110*, and proposes to approve Sir N. O'Connor's action ..	94
125	Sir N. O'Connor ..	70 Tel.	16,	Aden. Refers to No. 100. May he instruct Mr. Fitzmaurice to sign <i>procès-verbal</i> ? ..	94
126	" ..	226	8,	Yemen. Mobilization of St. Jean d'Acre Brigade. Despatch from Colonel Maunsell respecting ..	95
127	India Office	17,	Aden. Telegram from Viceroy of 15th April. His Majesty's Government should accept compromise, ceding Juban to Turks (see No. 130) ..	96
128	"	17,	Muscat. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 15th April. Points to be emphasized in British Counter-Case ..	96

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
129	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	46 Tel.	Apr. 17, 1905	Aden. Informs of No. 127. To instruct Mr. Fitzmaurice to sign <i>procès-verbal</i> ..	97
130	India Office	17,	Aden. Transmits telegrams to Viceroy of 4th and 5th April. Requests views as to compromise, &c. ..	97
131	"	18,	Aden. Telegrams from and to Viceroy of 15th and 17th April. Concurs in Juban arrangement and erection of two pillars at Sheikh Saïd. Refers to No. 127..	97
132	Sir N. O'Connor ..	241	15,	Yemen. Position of Sanaa precarious. Telegrams from Jeddah and Hodeida respecting ..	98
133	India Office	18,	Revised Treaty with Amir of Dthala. Transmits correspondence respecting, with copy of, as ratified by Indian Government ..	98
134	"	18,	Abu Musa Island. Red oxide mines on. Sheikhs have promised not to enter into Treaty with Mr. Wonckhaus ..	108
135	Telegram from Turkish Commandant, Bagdad, communicated by Musurus Pasha	19,	Bahrein. Hostile proceedings of His Majesty's ships at. Complaints of. Refers to No. 96 ..	108
136	To India Office	19,	Bubian Island. Refers to No. 113. Transmits Nos. 94 and 114. Awaits opinion of Sir N. O'Connor respecting ..	108
137	Sir N. O'Connor ..	72 Tel.	21,	Aden. Signature of <i>procès-verbal</i> . Terms of ..	109
138	India Office	19	Aden. Refers to No. 124. Concurs in approving Sir N. O'Connor's action ..	109
139	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	50 Tel.	23,	Aden. His Majesty's Government's approval to be conveyed to Mr. Fitzmaurice. Refers to No. 137 ..	110
140	Sir A. Hardinge ..	57 Confidential	Mar. 16,	Koweit Arabs in Persia. Refers to No. 44*. Port; objects to treatment of, otherwise than as Ottoman subjects. Representations to Mushir-ed-Dowleh respecting. Instructions issued by M. Naus to Customs officers on Persian Gulf..	110
141	Sir N. O'Connor ..	248 Confidential	Apr. 17,	Bubian Island. Refers to No. 114. Preferable not to raise question of withdrawal of Turkish military post ..	112
142	" ..	252	18,	Yemen. Mobilization of Redifs at Janina not proceeding satisfactorily ..	113
143	" ..	258	18,	Yemen. Reform Commission to be dispatched to. Members of ..	114
144	" ..	259	18,	Yemen. Mahmoud Shefkeh Pasha to be President of Reform Commission ..	114
145	M. Geoffray	26,	Muscat arbitration. French Government agree to notifying Tribunal of concurrent use of French and English ..	115
146	Sir N. O'Connor ..	76 Tel.	28,	Yemen. Syrian troops have mutinied. Sanaa surrendered to Imam ..	115
147	To Sir H. Howard ..	33	28,	Muscat. Transmits copies of British Counter-Case for communication to Tribunal ..	115

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
148	To Sir H. Howard ..	31	Apr. 29, 1905	Muscat. Transmits correspondence with M. Cambon respecting introduction of name of Sultan in British Case. Refers to Nos. 39, 82, and 122 ..	116

ERRATA.

Page 32. For "Inclosure in No. 48," read "Inclosure in No. 49."

Page 56, No. 79, line 4. For "for Mr. Fitzmaurice," read "from Mr. Fitzmaurice."

CONFIDENTIAL.Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of
Arabia.PART II.

No. 1.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 1.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 26th January, relative to affairs in Arabia and the Persian Gulf.

India Office, February 28, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 1.

Extract from the "Al-Ahram" of September 16, 1904.

ARABIA.

(From our Special Correspondent at Muscat.)

IT is now established that Ibn-i-Rashid has been defeated and Ibn-i-Saood has gained victory.

But the report about the death of Ibn-i-Rashid is false; also is the report of Ibn-i-Saood capturing six guns of the Turkish troops untrue. Ibn-i-Saood captured only one gun, while the remaining guns had been rendered useless by the Turkish troops. The most important thing is that the Sheikh of Koweit has given up his neutrality and has openly taken protection of the English. You have heard that Mubarak Ibn-i-Sabah sent a telegram to the Sublime Porte, intimating that if the Turkish troops did not abstain from helping Ibn-i-Rashid then he would assist Ibn-i-Saood, and seek protection of a foreign Power, who would protect him from all harm. He further added in the telegram that foreign Powers desire to extend their protection to the Arab Amirs, but the latter prefer to remain subjects of His Majesty the Sultan.

But the Sublime Porte did not send him a reply. Consequently, Mubarak sought protection of the English, who have been trying to gain this object for four years past.

On the 8th April, 1903, Mr. Balfour stated in the House of Commons that the Sheikh of Koweit had entered into special Agreements with the English. But the

Sheikh repudiated this statement and said that he was subject to the Sublime Porte. And now he has since two weeks openly renounced his allegiance to the Sultan, and has permitted a British Consul to reside at Koweit. The English have also established a post-office there, and the Consul is now endeavouring to open a small dispensary for the treatment of the poor Arab sick freely.

In this way the English have got their footing and flag fixed in Koweit, which is Turkish territory, by the consent of Sheikh Mubarak. Koweit is the key of Arabia in the Persian Gulf. It is key of Irak, and the territory between the two rivers, as the roads lead easily and without obstacles to the interior of Irak from Koweit. In addition to this, Mubarak is on friendly terms with the Sheikhs who reside along these roads. Mubarak has been helping all the Sheikhs for a distance of 500 miles, who break out into rebellion, and he supplies them with arms and ammunition and other supplies they want. All that he requires comes from India, and if it were not for the help of Mubarak the said Arabs would not be able to rebel for want of supplies. Mail steamers call once a week at Koweit via Muscat; and the Koweit merchants ship every week hundreds of rifles and ammunition, &c., to Koweit. They have adopted a well-known practice, i.e., they write on the cases containing fire-arms "cases containing sweetmeats;" and those holding cartridges, "dried limes." The Customs officials at Muscat do not inquire about the contents of the cases, while the English officers, who last year made such a noise, when they found a Frenchman carrying six revolvers, shut their eyes when these cases are concerned.

The Customs officials at Bushire once opened one of these cases and found fifty rifles in it, and a large number of cartridges. But the English Consul came there and shut their mouths and pressed their hands, and prevented them from making further inspection of the cases, and the arms were restored to the owners, who took them over to Sheikh Mubarak.

Thus Ibn-i-Saood obtains his arms from Koweit and the latter from the English; and so the English are the agents who supply the Arabs with arms.

I know as a fact that, had not the English made a present of four guns to Mubarak, the latter would not have been able to capture Boreida, which is a strong position and considered in Arabia to be invincible.

It is often that Mubarak has not to pay for these arms and ammunition, because if he had to do so, he would soon be reduced to poverty. A short time after this the English sent him a lakh of rupees.

The Arab rebels cannot find a better help. You may remember that Sheikh Sa'dun-bin-Mansur, the Sheikh of the Muttafik tribe, attacked a detachment of Turkish troops in December last, and then raided the suburbs of Bussorah. When he feared retribution he took refuge at Koweit, and remained under the protection of English guns. After a few months he returned to his place, but did not remain at peace. He plundered a Turkish Kafilah, and nothing was done to him. He is now residing in quiet and without any anxiety. The English have only one line of policy in this country, i.e., to incite the Rulers to oppress the people, and then to offer aid to the oppressed people and gain their hearts. It were the English who pressed the Turkish Government to deal severely with Mubarak-bin-Sabar, to secure peace to the country, the commerce, and the Turkish and the English subjects. When the Sublime Porte acted in accordance with the advice given by the English and began to bring pressure on Sheikh Mubarak, then they offered to protect Mubarak from the danger, and the latter, with his tribesmen, placed himself under the British protection.

I warn the high officials of the Sublime Government, in a loud voice, to be careful about the intrigues of the English in Irak, because they are now casting greedy eyes upon that fertile land watered by two streams. Irak excels Egypt in fertility; and he who possesses this land gets hold of all commerce of the East from Anatolia, Arabia, India, the shores of China, Afghanistan, Thibet, Khiva, Burmah, and Siam.

The scheme of the English is greater than what you suppose and dream. If you allow things to go on as before you will see to-morrow that this young man, Ibn-i-Saood, will become more important than necessary, and more serious than you think. Then make use of artifice and not force, and seek aid of the French and Russians, in order to defend yourselves against this aggression; nothing else will prevent their intrigues. The first step has been taken by them, but you should prevent them from taking the second, before it could be said, "the rent has increased beyond the ability of the mender."

(Signed) A. RAHIM.

October 5, 1904.

(Indorsed by the Foreign Department.)

October 27, 1904.

A copy of the foregoing paper is forwarded to the Political Resident, Persian Gulf, for information and communication to the Political Agent, Muscat, with a view to his ascertaining, as far as possible, the source from which the article emanated.

Inclosure 2 in No. 1.

Major Grey to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Muscat, November 22, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith, for your information, a copy of letter, dated the 22nd instant, which I have addressed to the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, Bushire.

Inclosure 3 in No. 1.

Major Grey to Major Cox.

Muscat, November 22, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to reply to your demi-official letter forwarding an extract from the journal "Al-Ahram," of Cairo, which had been sent to you by the Government of India in the Foreign Department with their indorsement dated the 27th ultimo, for an expression of opinion as to its authorship.

2. I have no doubt that M. Goguyer is responsible for the contents of the extract. My reasons for forming this opinion are:—

(1.) He possesses a knowledge of Koweit and Koweit affairs probably unequalled by any other non-official resident of Muscat.

(2.) The excessive anti-English bias which is noticeable in many of his former writings also appears in this article, and I know of no other person in Muscat who entertains such hatred of us.

(3.) The article clearly implies that arms are imported into Koweit by the English. M. Goguyer knows well that the (apparent) inconsistency of publicly forbidding and privately encouraging the importation of arms by us would be thoroughly understood by the natives in the present circumstances, and the manner in which the ideas are expressed in this extract bears the stamp of his ingenious manipulation.

(4.) It is possible that the writer's remarks concerning the conveyance of arms to Koweit by merchants in mail steamers are made in the hope of inducing action to be taken, which will leave the Koweit field in possession of those who send their consignments in dhows, as M. Goguyer does (*vide* my letter dated the 24th May last).

3. A copy of this letter will be forwarded to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department, Calcutta.

Inclosure 4 in No. 1.

Major Grey to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Muscat, December 6, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to place before you briefly the position of affairs in Muscat as regards the arms trade.

I beg to invite a reference to paragraph 3 of Secret despatch dated 6th March, 1902, from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, and to ask whether it would not be possible to make another effort for the abolition of arms trade in Oman. My French colleague informed me recently that his Government had no intention of expelling Goguyer from Muscat, and the Sultan meanwhile makes the best of a bad job by being friendly with his old enemy. On the other hand, Goguyer, while he has apparently desisted from writing against His Highness (possibly in accordance with instructions received—*vide* the inclosure to my letter dated the 28th June last), has by no means ceased his unfair and hostile criticism of our policy in the Persian Gulf and

elsewhere. His expulsion from Muscat would therefore appear to be more than ever desirable from our point of view.

4. However, the point to which I desire to invite attention at present is that no half-way position on our part is advisable as regards the arms trade in the present circumstances. Either we must move for its abolition, or we must, by supporting our merchants, render the presence of foreigners in Muscat as innocuous as possible to our commercial prospects generally. Were the latter course adopted, it might be possible not only to retain control over the traffic, but eventually to effect the removal of certain foreigners without the employment of compulsion.

Inclosure 5 in No. 1.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

May 29, 1904.

NEJD. Your telegram dated the 25th May.

Position of Government of India in regard to Nejd affairs is stated in Secret letter of the 24th March last. Representation might be made to the Porte to effect that, so long as the Turks abstained from interference in affairs of Nejd, we also refrained from intervention; that we are in no way desirous of giving direct or indirect assistance to Bin Saoud; but that our interests in Eastern Arabia are such that intervention on behalf of one of the parties who are contending for supremacy in Nejd cannot be viewed by us with indifference, as tribes with which we have relations cannot but be affected by such intervention; that the relative rights of the two contending parties are so equal that, with a view to the avoidance of internal troubles, and in the interests of peace, the better course would be to leave both sides alone. Sir N. O'Connor might further point out that the Turks were unable in 1902 to prevent a filibustering expedition setting out against Koweit from Turkish territory, and that the support now being given to Ibn Rashid may strengthen him beyond Turkish powers of control, and that this might create a situation which could not be viewed with indifference by His Majesty's Government, having regard to our relations with the Sheikh of Koweit.

Our opinion as regards Sir N. O'Connor's views on the general political situation is as follows:—Our influence with the Sheikh of Koweit has increased concurrently with the success of his friend, Bin Saoud, and if, as a result of active intervention on our part for the purpose of preventing Mubarak from helping Bin Saoud, and of preventing the importation of arms, Turkish influence were allowed to determine the supremacy of the Turkish nominee against Bin Saoud, our prestige at Koweit must suffer materially, and it would probably, on the analogy of El Hasa in 1870, mean the absorption of Nejd by the Turks. The destruction of Sheikh Mubarak's influence would be a natural result of the supremacy of the Turks in Nejd, and possibly also an attack would follow upon the territory of Koweit, the limits of which towards the interior are not defined, from a direction not hitherto contemplated. In this way we might be compelled once more to render Mubarak active assistance against the Turks. This would, in our opinion, be open to greater objection than the re-establishment of the Wahabi dynasty, which is now not so much fanatical as territorial. We are unable, therefore, to accept the view that the success of Bin Saoud would imperil our authority at Koweit, or that we can preserve intact the territory of Koweit better than by preventing the Turks from intervening on behalf of Ibn Rashid.

As regards posting a Political Agent at Koweit, we entirely concur (*vide* my telegram of the 20th May). We are of opinion that wholesome effect upon Turkish attitude of mind might not improbably be produced by such action, and, if you approve, an officer will be selected immediately to fill the post.

As regards arms, no arrangements have been made with the Porte up to the present for the combined suppression of the traffic, and the importation of arms is proceeding briskly. It is thus not a case of authorizing the Sheikh of Koweit to import arms, or even of relaxing measures at present in force for the prevention of the traffic, but merely of letting matters remain as they are. Should the Turkish Government protest (and such a protest would involve an admission by them of our supremacy in Koweit that would be useful), we can offer to do our best to prevent the trade, if they on their part will refrain from interfering in affairs of Nejd, and will co-operate with us as suggested in our despatch of the 31st March, 1904.

No. 2.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 1.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of an inclosure in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 2nd February, relative to the French Vice-Consul at Muscat.

India Office, February 28, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 2.

Major Grey to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Muscat, January 14, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to make the following report for the information of the Government of India:—

2. Three days ago a rumour reached me that the French Vice-Consul and his Dragoman had made secret arrangements for travelling overland to Sur, and intended to start immediately. I referred the matter personally to His Highness the Sultan, who said that he had heard nothing of the project, but would write to inquire. This he did at once, and a reply was received in due course to the effect that my colleague had telegraphed to his Government for leave to proceed to Kurrachee for a month's change of air, and that, should permission not be granted, he intended to visit Seeb or Boshier in His Highness' dominions.

3. There is no doubt that M. Billecocq had made preparations for the overland journey to Sur, and that he would have slipped away quietly had he not been prevented by a severe attack of fever. Under advice from the Agency Surgeon he will now proceed to Kurrachee, provided that a favourable reply to his application is received from Paris.

4. Although the few commercial cases (connected with M. Goguyer and others) in which I have had to employ the mediation of M. Billecocq have been readily and promptly settled, and my personal relations with him leave nothing to be desired, he loses no opportunity of slighting the Sultan, and I consider it to be highly advisable that he should be dissuaded from travelling in Oman until the question of protégés is finally decided. For the present the scheme is in abeyance, and His Highness, who agrees with me, will try to prevent its being carried into effect on M. Billecocq's return to Muscat. With this object, however, it is difficult for him to employ more than advice or persuasion in his present position.

5. A copy of this letter will be forwarded to the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, Bushire.

No. 3.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 70.)

Foreign Office, March 1, 1905.

Sir,

I TOLD the Turkish Ambassador to-day that I had made inquiry into the complaints which he had addressed to me on the 28th December and the 7th January in regard to the conduct of certain British officers in the neighbourhood of Koweit. I found that the facts were as follows:—

1. The officers concerned never contemplated a visit to Nejd, and have abandoned their journey to El Hasa.

2. The visit to Nejef was also abandoned, and they have finally quitted Turkish Arabia.

3. The five vessels mentioned by the Turkish Government could only be the boats of the "Investigator."

4. The "British functionary" referred to must be either Major Knox or Mr. Gabriel, who visited Um Kasr, but the allegations as to their having incited the

[1517]

C

tribes were absolutely untrue. The officers in question were careful to hold no communication with them.

5. Sheikh Mubarak had never hoisted the British flag on any occasion whatever. A temporary survey flag might possibly have been mistaken for it.

I gave his Excellency a written Memorandum to the above effect, and I begged him to inform the Turkish Government that His Majesty's Government felt bound to protest against the credence attached by the Turkish Government to every idle or exaggerated rumour which reached them from local officials on the shores of the Persian Gulf. I had invariably treated these remonstrances respectfully, and considerable trouble and expense had been incurred in investigating them. If, however, we continued to receive similar groundless accusations, we should be obliged to put all representations of the kind on one side as unworthy of serious attention. I begged his Excellency to repeat what I had said to the Turkish Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSLOWNE.

No. 4.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 3.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 28th ultimo, relative to the proposed Agreement with the Sheikh of El Katr.

India Office, March 2, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 4.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, February 28, 1905.

EL KATR. Your telegram of the 30th December, 1904.

His Majesty's Government are unwilling to raise any question affecting the *status quo* in this quarter at present, when there is a general sense of suspicion and insecurity prevalent in the neighbourhood of Persian Gulf. It is proposed that whole question of our policy in this region should be referred shortly to the Defence Committee for examination. As regards 1868 Agreement with El Katr Sheikh, it could only be made effective for the purpose in view by being given an interpretation considerably in excess of that which its actual terms would bear, and His Majesty's Government see no advantage in reviving it.

No. 5.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 3.)

(No. 47.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 3, 1905.

DELIMITATION of Aden frontier.

With reference to telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice of to-day's date, repeated to Secretary of State for India, I have approved action proposed by Mr. Fitzmaurice, but have advised him to press the Commission to urge that Memorandum of the 11th August be accepted. I presume that the necessary instructions will be sent in time to His Majesty's ship "Perseus."

No. 4 A.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 3.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 28th ultimo, relative to the troops in the Aden hinterland. (Copies have been sent to the Director of Military Operations and the War Office.)

India Office, March 2, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 4 A.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

February 28, 1905.

IN continuation of previous telegram of the 8th October last. We have decided to send balance of 3rd Battalion Rifle Brigade to Aden in consequence of disadvantages of retention detachments in India. Dthala garrison will be furnished by 3rd Battalion Rifle Brigade to take advantage of sanitarium for British troops. We are considering question whether wing native infantry regiment can be withdrawn from Aden.

No. 4 B.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 3.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 3rd instant, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 3, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 4 B.

Mr. Fitzmaurice to Sir N. O'Connor.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 3, 1905.

ADEN delimitation. No. 2.

Would it be of assistance towards expediting settlement if I were to proceed on His Majesty's ship "Perseus," which is now here at Perim, to visit Turkish Commissioner at Turba? I might be able to get him to telegraph to the Porte urging that demands contained in Lord Lansdowne's despatch No. 41 of the 5th ultimo be accepted. "Perseus" leaves on the 5th instant, and instructions should reach her Commander before that date if my proposal is approved.

(Repeated to Viceroy, Foreign Department, and Secretary of State.)

7

No. 6.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 19.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, March 3, 1905.

WHAT reply do you propose to send to Mr. Fitzmaurice's telegram No. 2 of the 3rd March, as to his proposal to visit the Turkish Commissioner to expedite a settlement of the Aden frontier question?

No. 7.

Foreign Office to Admiralty.

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 3, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you herewith, to be laid before the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, copies of two telegrams on the subject of the Aden delimitation.*

The Lords Commissioners will observe that Mr. Fitzmaurice suggests that a settlement of this question might be hastened if he were able to visit the Turkish Commissioner at Turba in His Majesty's ship "Perseus," which is now at Perim. He urges that, if his suggestion is adopted, instructions may be sent to the Commander of the "Perseus" before he leaves Perim on the 5th instant.

It will be seen that His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople approves Mr Fitzmaurice's proposal.

I am to request that you will move their Lordships to cause immediate instructions, in the sense suggested by Mr. Fitzmaurice, to be sent to the Commander of the "Perseus," should they see no objection.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON

No. 8.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 6.)

(No. 130. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 28, 1905.

IN continuation of my despatch No. 112 of the 14th instant, I have the honour to report that the state of the Yemen continues to give the Turkish Government the greatest concern. On the 20th instant the Mutessarif of Taaz telegraphed that the Caza of Yerim had been invaded by the rebels, and that Kataba and Ab were so closely besieged that there remained no hope of relieving them, whilst the communications between Taaz and Sana'a, which had been fitfully carried out of late via Mokha, were likely to be completely stopped.

The Mutessarif of Hodeida has also telegraphed that the battalion of troops at Hijeh, having refused to surrender, have been massacred by the rebels, and that the troops in Sana'a itself are worn out after continuous fighting for five days, and have begun to flee.

A later telegram from the Assistant Vali of the Yemen and the Mutessarif of Hodeida states that a letter has been received from the Commandant of Hijeh, stating that the garrison has eaten all their cattle and have no food, and that they must all perish unless relief arrives within two days, and the munitions there, consisting of four guns, 2,000 rifles, and more than 1,000 cases of ammunition, will fall into the hands of the rebels. It is probable that this letter took longer to reach Hodeida than the news of the massacre of the garrison of Hijeh, and that the Commandant's fears have been justified.

* Nos. 4a and 5.

A still later telegraphic report from Hodeida has been received from the two above-named officials, stating that the three companies of troops at Mansouria, Canton of Ar, Caza of Haraz, have passed into the hands of the rebels, with their officers and the Mudir of the Canton, that the Caza of Anis is blockaded, and that the rebels have occupied Zeemar and Yerim, and are marching on Taaz and Kataba.

It is asserted here, as I have had the honour to report to your Lordship by telegraph, that the Aden authorities are alarmed at the state of affairs at Kataba, and fearing lest the rebels may enter the territory of the Sheikh of Dthali, are marching up troops to protect the frontier.

Great difficulties have been experienced in the transport of the troops of the 5th Army Corps dispatched to the Yemen between Ma'an and Akaba. The season has been very unfavourable, and the intense drought experienced on the road has caused great mortality among the camels and other transport animals. Riza Pasha, who is proceeding to the Yemen to take command of the troops, has not yet been able to leave Akaba, where there is good reason to believe that the troops are in a mutinous condition.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 9.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 6.)

(No. 49.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 6, 1905.

ADEN delimitation.

Does your Lordship approve of my omitting fourth condition in your despatch No. 41 of the 7th ultimo? I am assured by the Turkish Government that no reference will be made to this point in their official reply to my representations.

No. 10.

Sir F. Bertie to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 7.)

(No. 87.)

My Lord,

Paris, March 6, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 11 of the 1st instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship a copy of a note from M. Delcassé on the subject of the selection of an Umpire for the Muscat Arbitration.

I have, &c.
(Signed) FRANCIS BERTIE.

Inclosure in No. 10.

M. Delcassé to Sir F. Bertie.

Paris, le 3 Mars, 1905.

M. l'Ambassadeur,

EN portant à ma connaissance, sous la date du 28 Février dernier, que les deux membres déjà désignés du Tribunal Arbitral chargé de trancher le litige relatif aux boutriers Mascatais n'avaient pu s'entendre dans le délai prévu sur le choix du Surarbitre, vous avez bien voulu me faire part du désir manifesté par le Marquis de Lansdowne que les Ambassadeurs des deux Puissances à Rome effectuent auprès du Gouvernement Royal une démarche commune en vue de solliciter de Sa Majesté le Roi Victor Emmanuel la nomination du Surarbitre.

Informé, moi-même, dès le 27 du mois dernier, de la nécessité d'appliquer les stipulations prévues par l'Article 1^{er} du Compromis d'Arbitrage du 13 Octobre, 1904, en cas de désaccord persistant entre les Arbitres, j'ai déjà donné, d'urgence, à l'Ambassadeur de la République près Sa Majesté le Roi d'Italie des instructions conformes à la demande dont votre Excellence s'est fait l'interprète.

No. 12*.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 7.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Mr. FitzMaurice, dated the 7th March, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 7, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 12*.

*Mr. FitzMaurice to India Office.**March 7, 1905.*

(Telegraphic.) P.
ADEN delimitation.

I have sent the following telegram No. 3, dated the 5th March, to British Embassy at Constantinople:—

"Unfavourable weather has set in to-day, and I am afraid may continue for some days. The instructions sent to His Majesty's ship "Perseus" and received to-day are contingent on state of monsoon."

[1517]

D*

J'ajoute que j'ai invité, sous la date du 1^{er} de ce mois, M. Paul Cambon à transmettre ces indications au Secrétaire d'État pour les Affaires Étrangères.

Agréez, &c.
(Signé) DELCASSE.

No. 11.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received March 7.)

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Admiralty, March 4, 1905.

WITH reference to your letter of the 3rd instant relative to the Aden delimitation, and requesting that His Majesty's ship "Perseus" should be directed to convey the British Commissioner to Turba to meet the Turkish Commissioner, I am commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, copy of a telegram which has this day been sent to the Commanding Officer of the "Perseus," directing him to give effect to Lord Lansdowne's wishes.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EVAN MACGREGOR.

Inclosure in No. 11.

Admiralty to Officer Commanding His Majesty's ship "Perseus," Perim.

(Telegraphic.)

Admiralty, March 4, 1905.

HIS MAJESTY'S Government is desirous of sending British Commissioner, Aden delimitation, to visit Turkish Commissioner at Turba in order to hasten settlement. Arrange to convey him in "Perseus" to Turba and bring him back, but movements and questions of laying off Turba must depend on monsoon. If too strong service should be deferred until it has moderated. Commander-in-chief informed. Acknowledge.

No. 12.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 7.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 6th March, relative to affairs at Bahrein.

India Office, March 7, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 12.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 6, 1905.

BAHREIN. Resident in Persian Gulf transmits, on the 3rd instant, the following telegram dispatched from Bahrein on the 1st instant:—

"Measures are now progressing satisfactorily, Sheikh having so far complied with our demands as to render it unnecessary to commence actual hostilities. One ship should remain here for a time, but the other two will be able to leave in one or two days."

This telegram has been communicated to the naval authorities.

[1517]

D

No. 13.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 21.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, March 7, 1905.

YOU may omit point 4 of our demands in connection with the Aden frontier, as suggested in your telegram No. 49 of to-day. We have distinctly rejected any attempt to attach to the settlement any condition which limits our right to send troops into the nine cantons, and if the question is dropped by the Turks I do not think we need allude to it.

No. 14.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 8.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 7th March, relative to the Muscat arbitration.

India Office, March 7, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 14.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 7, 1905.

MUSCAT arbitration. Your telegrams of the 17th February and the 1st March. As regards points referred to in the last sentence of your telegram, a communication will be made to you direct by Resident in Persian Gulf, as well as by Government of India, at an early date. Meanwhile proposal of Foreign Office does not seem to me to be open to objection.

(Repeated to Resident, Persian Gulf.)

No. 15.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 8.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 7th instant, relative to the affairs of South-West Arabia.

India Office, March 8, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 15.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 7, 1905.

ADEN.

On the 24th February Bombay Government transmitted the following telegram, also dated the 24th February, from Resident at Aden:—

"Report received from Officer Commanding at Dthala to the effect that force of Imam march upon Kataba. Turkish Kaïmakam is reported to be coming to Jalela with other refugees. Our relations with Imam are reported friendly at present, but difficulty arises as to Turkish refugees, and I request that I may receive instructions by telegraph how they are to be dealt with. Amir of Dthala objects to refugees going to Jalela, and suggests that they should go to Dthala instead. Jacob proposes that

they should be sent either across to Mavia, which is situated west-south-west of Dthala, or else further south. I am taking steps to establish communication with Dthala by heliograph."

On the 25th February the Bombay Government telegraphed, with reference to this above, as follows:—

"It seems important that orders should be sent to Resident to the effect that Kaïmakam and other refugees from Kataba should be received at Dthala, on behalf of the British Government, and well treated, and that they should be passed on from Dthala to Aden pending further instructions. Refugees must come to us, and not any of the tribes; to permit them to go elsewhere in our Protectorate seems most undesirable.

"Political Officer at Dthala, while affording refuge to Kaïmakam, and passing him on, can make it clear that we cannot allow our territory to be made base for operations against Imam. It is imperative that Imam should have no possible excuse for pursuing or attacking within the limits of our territory, and an intimation that our boundary must be respected should be conveyed to Imam by Resident, should circumstances appear to require it. We have instructed Resident, pending further orders, to act in accordance with the above telegram, which has been repeated to him."

Government of India propose to approve the orders which Bombay Government have issued. The latest report which has been received from Aden, in telegram dated the 28th February, states that only a few of Kaïmakam's relations are proceeding to Aden at present, Kaïmakam himself remaining at Kataba, where, according to native reports, Turkish reinforcements are expected. Imam is reported to be at Yarim.

(Repeated to Government of Bombay.)

No. 16.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 80.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 8, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador communicated to me to-day a report to the following effect from the Governor of Nejd:—

Letters had been received from Bahrein by merchants of Aha, stating that, on the complaint of a German merchant who had been beaten by Ali Ahmed, nephew of Eesa Ben Ali, Sheikh of Bahrein, and his men, two British ships had appeared at Bahrein, and their Commanders had demanded that the culprits should be immediately handed over to them. As Ali Ahmed had fled to Fitra, his men were delivered over to the Commanders, and were only set free after a severe beating, and the payment of a fine of 6,000 rupees.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 17.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 88.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 8, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador made to me to-day a statement to the following effect:—

The Vali of Bussorah had telegraphed that two British ships of war had arrived at Bahrein, and had anchored the one between Bussorah and Menama, the other opposite the latter place, at which the construction of a guard-house had been commenced.

As this locality was in the Sandjak of Nejd and formed an integral part of the Ottoman Empire, any encroachment would infringe the rights of the Imperial Government and would be contrary to Treaty.

Musurus Pasha was instructed to request that His Majesty's Government would give orders for the cessation of the works which had been commenced.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 18.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 9.)

Sir,

India Office, March 8, 1905.

IN continuation of Sir H. Walpole's letter of the 18th ultimo, on the subject of the note from the French Ambassador of the 6th ultimo, regarding the British Case recently presented to The Hague Tribunal, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose, for the information of the Marquess of Lansdowne, a copy of the reply of the Government of India to his telegram of the 17th ultimo.

It will be seen that the Government of India concur in Lord Lansdowne's proposed answer to M. Cambon.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure in No. 18.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 7, 1905.

MUSCAT arbitration. Your telegrams of the 17th February and the 1st March.

As regards points referred to in the last sentence of your telegram, a communication will be made to you direct by Resident in Persian Gulf, as well as by Government of India, at an early date. Meanwhile proposal of Foreign Office does not seem to me to be open to objection.

(Repeated to Resident, Persian Gulf.)

No. 19.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 9.)

Sir,

India Office, March 9, 1905.

WITH reference to your letter of the 27th ultimo,* and previous letters forwarding reports on the progress of the insurrection in Yemen, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to forward, for the information of the Marquess of Lansdowne, a copy of a telegram from the Viceroy,† reporting the orders which the Government of Bombay have issued to the Resident at Aden, in view of the probability that the Kaimakam of Kataba will be compelled to seek refuge in Amiri territory.

Subject to Lord Lansdowne's concurrence, Mr. Brodrick proposes to approve these instructions.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

* Forwarding Mr. Townley's telegram, No. 44.

† No. 15.

No. 20.

Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley.—(Received at the Foreign Office, March 11.)

(No. 7.)

Sir,

Bussorah, February 18, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatches and telegrams respecting the affairs of Nejd and Koweit, I have the honour to submit the following incomplete summary of my information.

The Turkish expedition of last summer and autumn in aid of Ibn Rashid into the Kasim district of Nejd seems to have failed entirely. It is commonly said here that not more than 700 Turkish soldiers now remain near Hail out of an original expeditionary force of about 2,000, and that there have not been many more in Nejd since the last engagement, that near Al Russ of the 27th September, 1904. There would appear to have been a heavy loss from disease and desertion. Out of six guns, one was lost, and three more, recaptured from Ibn Saoud, had, it seems, been damaged and made useless. A military informant said, early in December, that there were about 4,000 Turkish troops near Hail, which seems a monstrous exaggeration, to say the least of it. Perhaps some troops came from Medina, but I have no information about that. At any rate, it is certain that the Turkish troops have done nothing since the above-mentioned engagement. An apparent result of the failure was the fact that about the end of last October Fakhri Pasha, Acting Vali of Bussorah, wrote, under instructions, no doubt, from Constantinople, a letter to Abd-ur-rahman Ibn Faysul, the old father of the person commonly known as Ibn Saoud, inviting him to come and settle the affairs of Kasim in a friendly meeting. About the end of November a letter was received from Abd-ur-rahman by the Vali Mukhlis Pasha. Informants who ought to know state that the letter was in the handwriting of Sheikh Mubarek's Secretary at Koweit, which is 300 or 400 miles away from the place where Abd-ur-rahman was. This is explained by supposing that the letter was sent with all speed from Koweit for signature, or that the Sheikh of Koweit had been intrusted with the seal of Abd-ur-rahman. The letter consisted of professions of loyalty to the Sultan, and requests not to send troops to Kasim, because the people of Kasim would have none of Ibn Rashid, and there would be bloodshed. About the same time a telegram to the same effect to the Palace from Abd-ur-rahman passed through Bussorah, and another to the same effect to the Palace from the Kaimakam of Katr, Jasim-ibn-Thani, who, though called Kaimakam, would appear to be almost independent, and to have become a friend of Ibn Saoud and Sheikh Mubarek, though he was formerly their enemy.

About the middle of November Faik Pasha, Mutessarif of Hassa, was dismissed from his post, in consequence perhaps of a telegram to the Vali, signed by a Colonel, who has now become Acting Mutessarif of Hassa, three Majors, and the accountant of the Mutessariflik, accusing him of facilitating the dispatch of arms and provisions to the Saoud, of sheltering his adherents, of exciting Ottoman soldiers and others to disloyalty, and of carrying on a correspondence with Ibn Saoud and Sheikh Mubarek and receiving their emissary. There is, I am told, no foundation for these charges, and they certainly appear not to have been brought home to Faik Pasha. He appears to have proved incapable as an administrator. He held an inquiry into the case of his predecessor, Sayyed Talib, pillaging the house of Mansur Pasha (see my despatch No. 31 of the 21st June, 1904), and sent reports which may have damaged Sayyed Talib Pasha's position in Constantinople.

Since the beginning of last November, at any rate, Sheikh Mubarek seems to have been in open communication with Ibn Saoud and Abd-ur-rahman. On the 20th January three Nejd merchants, living in Bussorah, were sent off in exile to Constantinople, on a charge of giving information to Ibn Saoud. I cannot understand whether the specific charge is true or false. Two of them certainly a year ago used to give him information. One of these two is the Bussorah agent of one Shubeyli in Nejd, who is a close personal and business friend of Sheikh Mubarek. The latter now complains, quite groundlessly, as I understand, that, in consequence of the cessation of Shubeyli's business in Bussorah, he (Mubarek) is losing a large sum of money. Mubarek, I imagine, for some purpose of his own, wishes to excite our sympathy by such allegations of pecuniary loss.

It is surprising, and seems to indicate a desire on the Sultan's part to avoid bloodshed by peacefully garrisoning Kasim, that, while a large Turkish force is

apparently marching from the Vilayet of Baghdad into Nejd, two, more or less friendly, though I believe quite inconclusive, meetings should just now, by order from Constantinople, have taken place in the Bussorah Vilayet between the Vali, Abd-ur-rahman and the Sheikh of Koweit, who has now signed himself, in his telegram to the Vali, "Ruler of Koweit and Chief of its tribes," and has, in the first meeting as I have it from several sources, much displeased the Vali by his persistent assertion of this independent position.

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

P.S. - I will send a further despatch by next mail.

J. H. M.

No. 21.

Sir E. Egerton to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 11.)

(No. 34.)
My Lord,

Rome, March 8, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's telegram No. 9 of the 27th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a note which, after consultation with the French Ambassador, I have addressed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and in which, in accordance with your Lordship's instructions, I asked his Excellency to submit to His Majesty the King of Italy the request of His Majesty's Government and of the French Government that His Majesty would be pleased to nominate an Umpire in the arbitration relative to the Muscat dhows flying the French flag.

A copy of the note addressed by M. Barrère to M. Tittoni is also inclosed.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EDWIN H. EGERTON.

Inclosure 1 in No. 21.

Note communicated by Sir E. Egerton to Signor Tittoni.

DIFFICULTIES as to the scope of the Anglo-French Declaration of the 10th March, 1862, in relation to the Muscat dhows navigating under the French flag having arisen, the Governments of the French Republic and of His Britannic Majesty have agreed that these questions shall be determined by reference to arbitration.

Sir E. Egerton has the honour to inclose herewith copy of the Agreement between the two Governments of the 13th October, 1904.

It appears that the two Arbitrators named have not been able to agree upon an Umpire within the time specified, and consequently, in accordance with Article 1 of the Agreement, it becomes necessary to intrust that choice to His Majesty the King of Italy.

His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador has now been charged by his Government to beg his Excellency the Royal Minister for Foreign Affairs to submit to the gracious assent of His Majesty the King of Italy the request of his Government, in concurrence with that of the Government of the French Republic, that His Majesty will be pleased to assist the conciliatory policy of the two Governments by conferring the favour on them of nominating an Umpire ("Sur-Arbitre"), as laid down in Article 1 of the inclosed Agreement.

Sir E. Egerton has the honour to renew to his Excellency M. Tittoni the assurance of his high consideration.

Rome, March 5, 1905.

Inclosure 2 in No. 21.

Note communicated by M. Barrère.

LE Gouvernement de la République Française et le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique s'étant trouvés en désaccord sur le sens et la portée de la Déclaration Franco-Anglaise du 10 Mars, 1862, par rapport aux "boutriers" de Mascate naviguant sous pavillon Français, ont décidé, le 13 Octobre, 1904, par un Compromis, dont copie est ci-jointe, de remettre à la Cour Arbitrale de La Haye le règlement de cette difficulté.

Les deux Arbitres choisis à cet effet parmi les membres de la Cour Permanente d'Arbitrage, M. de Savornin-Lohman, Membre de la 2^e Chambre des États-Généraux de Hollande, pour la France, et Mr. Melvill W. Fuller, Président de la Cour Suprême des États-Unis, pour la Grande-Bretagne, n'ont pu, dans le délai d'un mois qui leur était imparti, s'entendre sur la nomination d'un Sur-Arbitre. Les Hautes Parties en cause ont donc résolu, d'un commun accord, en application de l'Article 1^{er} du Compromis, de confier à Sa Majesté le Roi d'Italie le soin de procéder à cette désignation.

L'Ambassadeur de la République a été chargé en conséquence de prier son Excellence le Ministre Royal des Affaires Étrangères de soumettre au gracieux agrément de Sa Majesté le désir ainsi formulé par les deux Gouvernements, et d'exprimer l'espoir que le Roi Victor Emmanuel voudra bien, en acceptant la mission qui lui est offerte, s'associer à cette manifestation de la politique conciliante de la France et de la Grande-Bretagne.

M. Barrère saisit cette occasion pour renouveler à son Excellence M. Tittoni les assurances de sa haute considération.

Rome, le 5 Mars, 1905.

No. 22.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 11.)

(No. 50.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 11, 1905.

DELIMITATION of Aden frontier.

Have just concluded satisfactory arrangement for delimitation of southern frontier to Sheikh Mirad.

The Vali of the Yemen will be informed that Commission are to proceed with delimitation of Yaffai Canton in due course; this will insure delimitation from Bana River north-east to the desert.

Does your Lordship approve of this arrangement? It covers the four places mentioned in your Lordship's despatch No. 41 of the 7th February, in so far as it may be proved that they belong to the Yaffai, and is substantially what we demand.

Instructions will be delayed pending my answer. I shall, therefore, be grateful for an early reply.

No. 23.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 13.)

(No. 139.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 4, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul-General at Damascus, reporting the arrival at, and departure from, that town of further Ottoman troops destined for service in the Yemen.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONNOR.

Inclosure in No. 23.

Consul-General Richards to Mr. Townley.

(No. 10.)

Sir,

Damascus, February 21, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 7 of the 7th instant, I have the honour to report the arrival here, and departure for the Yemen, of three Nizam battalions from Aleppo, and one Redif battalion from Homs, since that date. One Nizam battalion from the Hauran has also started direct for the same destination. I should also state that Lieutenant-General (Firik) Ali Riza Pasha, whose arrival here I reported in the despatch under reference, left Damascus on the 11th instant, accompanied by Colonel Izzet Bey of the staff here, and other officers who will constitute the General's staff, for Máan and Akaba, *en route* for the Yemen.

With reference to a paragraph in my despatch No. 3 of the 11th ultimo, I am given to understand that the Ferid Bey and Mustapha Effendi therein mentioned have left Damascus for Beirout, on their way to Yambo, where, it is said, they will meet a Liva (Major-General) and a Colonel (names unknown), coming from Constantinople, with whom they will proceed to the Nejd, there to form the staff of Mushir Feizi Pasha (of Bagdad), now supposed to be engaged in a special mission in that country.

So far as I know, nine battalions of troops, of whom five are Nizam and four are Redifs have, up to the present, left for the Yemen. It is possible that still another battalion (making ten in all) from the Jerusalem district has proceeded via Jericho and Amman to the same destination, but of this I have no certain knowledge.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. S. RICHARDS.

No. 24.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 13.)

(No. 140.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 4, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr. Townley's despatch No. 120 of the 16th ultimo, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Jerusalem, reporting the departure of five more battalions of Redifs for Akaba.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 24.

Consul Dickson to Mr. Townley.

(No. 7.)

Sir,

Jerusalem, February 15, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram of the 11th instant, I have the honour to report that five battalions of Redifs left, in the course of last week, this Mutessariflik by land for Akaba, where it is stated they will embark for Yemen.

Three of these battalions started from Jerusalem, and were to proceed across the Jordan to be conveyed by the Damascus-Mecca railway as far as the line has been constructed, and were then to march to Akaba. They were accompanied by Ali Pasha, the Military Commandant of Jerusalem.

Two other battalions, which were levied in the district of Gaza, marched direct from that place to Akaba.

These levies were not yet properly clothed or armed, but I am informed that they will receive their full equipment on reaching Akaba, and that the weapon with which they will be furnished will be the Mauser rifle.

The object, it appears, in dispatching these troops via Akaba is to avoid payment of the Suez Canal dues, which would be a heavy charge on the Imperial Treasury.

I have the honour to add that little is known here of the insurrectionary movement in Arabia, which has necessitated the calling out of such a large body of troops, but it is reported that the Vali of Yemen has been assassinated by the Arab tribes, after the siege and capture of the capital of the province.

I have, &c.

(Signed) JOHN DICKSON.

No. 25.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 13.)

(No. 154.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 7, 1905.

WITH reference to previous correspondence relative to the concentration of Turkish troops in the Yemen, I have the honour to inform your Lordship that I have this day received telegraphic information from His Majesty's Consul at Jeddah, to the effect that three large merchant-vessels are leaving that port for Akaba, in order to transport thence 6,000 Turkish troops to Hodeidah.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 26.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 13.)

(No. 157.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 8, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch which I have received from Colonel Maunsell, Military Attaché to the Embassy, respecting the progress of the Turkish expedition into Nejd from the Vilayet of Bagdad.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure 1 in No. 26.

Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 3.)

Sir,

Constantinople, March 7, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that in an interview with the War Minister yesterday, he mentioned that the expedition from Nejed into Nejd, under the Mushir Feizi Pasha, was still on its way towards Hail, and he expected it would reach there shortly, the distance being reckoned as twenty-five days from Nejed to Hail, but he did not seem very sanguine about it, and would not say where Feizi Pasha was at present.

He hoped to be able to send an expedition from Medina to assist by attacking Ibn Saoud from that side, as previously planned, but it had not yet left Medina. Feizi Pasha has taken seven battalions with him, and these with the four previously sent to assist Ibn Rashid, and which have suffered defeat, practically denudes the Bagdad Vilayet of regular troops, as there are also the troops in Katar and Katif to be deducted.

The Redif battalions are not of much military value in that corps, and many of the battalions have never been formed.

Sadun Pasha and the various sections of the Muntifk Arabs are reported to show signs of restlessness again, and, in connection with this question, I beg to attach a list of tribes under his control and their fighting strength, which I have recently received from Mr. Monahan, at Bussorah. It will be noticed that Sadun Pasha and tribes allied to him can produce about 7,500 fighting men, if they all combined. The

[1517]

F

Mushir Feizi Pasha is now an old man, and rather wanting in energy, but he has had experience in dealing with a former insurrection in the Yemen, which he suppressed with ruthless severity.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. R. MAUNSELL,
Military Attaché.

Inclosure 2 in No. 26.

Principal Tribes in Bussorah Vilayet.

I. Beni Lam (desert tribe from Amara to Kutal Amara).
Principal Sheikh, Ghadban, 15,000 horse, 10,000 foot; directly under him are—

			Horse.		Foot.
1. Hassan-el-Jandil	} Brothers	..	2,000	..	3,000
2. Muhammed-el-Jandil	
3. Gassab		..	1,500	..	2,500
(Each of these three has under him a sub-tribe.)					

Not directly under him are the following sub-tribes:—

			Horse.		Foot.
1. El Amara	..	4 Sheikhs	..	8,000	..
2. El Shanana	..	4 Sheikhs	..	12,000	..
3. Sberkha	..	3 Sheikhs	..	3,000	..

Attached to Beni Lam is—

Half of Segwand tribe (the other half is Persian) living along the Lower Kerka Valley in Persia.

II. Al-bu-Mohammed (marsh tribe from Amara to near Howeiza on Persian frontier).

Principal Sheikh, Saihud, 3,000 canoes, 6,000 foot.

Sub-tribes—

			Canoes.		Foot.
1. Hatim and Faleh (brothers)	3,000	..	6,000
2. Esmān and Zabūn (brothers)	600	..	1,000
3. El Sudan	1,500	..	200
	900	..	2,000
4. Souad	900	..	2,000

III. Muntafik—

Falih Pasha	400 followers.
Muziad Pasha	200 "
Muzial	200 "
Sadun	600 "

(All the above followers of these four Pashas are horsemen armed with Martinis.)

Attached to Muntafik—

Sheikh Deshem	} In all about 6,000 horse, armed with Martinis and Mausers, and all for the present attached to Sadun Pasha.
" Khairallah	
" Gabir	
" Hasham	

The Ahl-ul-Jezair (see "Gazetteer" of Bagdad, Simla, 1859, p. 128) are said to have disappeared as a tribe since they were attacked by the Turkish Government about three years ago.

(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN,
Acting British Consul.

Bussorah, January 14, 1905.

No. 27.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 13.)

(No. 158.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 8, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr. Townley's despatch No. 130 of the 28th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch from Colonel Maunsell, Military Attaché to this Embassy, on the subject of military affairs in the Yemen, respecting which I discern considerable anxiety at the Porte.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 27.

Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 4.)

Sir,

Constantinople, March 7, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that in an interview with the War Minister to-day he appeared rather hopeful regarding the state of affairs in the Yemen. Sanaa was still besieged by the rebels, but the road from the coast up to Menakha was still open to the Turkish troops.

Menakha is an important position, a kind of rocky stronghold, on the road half-way between Hodeidah and Sanaa, and it is now held by the Turkish troops again, although the rebels were apparently able to drive them out for a short time.

Ali Riza Pasha, the Commandant of the Relief Expedition, reached Hodeidah on the 5th instant and pushed inland immediately with a force of eight battalions (5,000 men) and eight mountain batteries.

His expedition should have consisted of twenty-four Syrian battalions, now on the way; but owing to the urgency of relieving Sanaa, he was obliged to leave with what men he could collect, most of whom had arrived from Kufida, where, since November 1903, the Adana Redif Brigade has been waiting on the coast to take part in an expedition in Assir, which never took place. It is a battalion of these unfortunate men who recently took possession of the Greek steamer in which they were going to Hodeidah and forced the captain to take them back to Mersina instead.

The War Minister mentioned that four battalions of the Syrian force are awaiting transports at Akaba and four more are on the railway at Maan ready to move down to Akaba.

After some considerable difficulty, transports have now been obtained, and three have left Jeddah for Akaba.

Urgent inquiries are also being made in Constantinople for vessels to carry flour and other food supplies with a small detachment of troops from here for Hodeidah, the supplies being very urgently needed.

Seven battalions (4,000 men) constitute the garrison now shut up in Sanaa, and the place is reported here to be in the last extremity, as also may be judged from the haste with which Ali Riza Pasha is pushing on his relief expedition. If his force should fail to reach the place in time, it also is in danger of being overwhelmed, as it is scarcely of sufficient strength, although much is hoped from the strong force of artillery which has been attached to it.

The main body of the Syrian force can only arrive in detachments from Akaba.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. R. MAUNSELL, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Military Attaché.

20

No. 28.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 13.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 12th March, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 13, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 28.

Mr. Fitzmaurice to Sir N. O'Connor.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 12, 1905.

WEATHER being favourable on the 11th instant, I proceeded in His Majesty's ship "Perseus" to visit the Turkish Commissioner at Turba Fort. He tells me that he has to-day dispatched an urgent telegram, not through the Vali, but direct to Constantinople, and he begs that tenour of his telegram may be considered confidential *vis-à-vis* Ottoman Government.

Message is to effect that British Commissioner, who came, contrary to his practice, in a man-of-war, had intimated that delay of Porte in agreeing to proposals of the Memorandum of the 11th August was causing vexation; that the moderate and friendly nature of those proposals was apparently not appreciated by the Ottoman Government, and that necessity of ending state of affairs which, if persisted in by that Government, might lead to cessation of the present negotiations, or their taking a turn less favourable to Turkey, had impressed itself on the British Government.

The Commissioner's telegram, after recapitulating terms of the August Memorandum, expresses fear lest Turkish interests may be prejudiced by further delay, and surmises that my present visit may be prelude to measures of a more serious nature.

(Repeated to Secretary of State for India, and Foreign Secretary, Calcutta.)

No. 29.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 13.)

(No. 51.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 13, 1905.

DELIMITATION of Aden frontier.

If His Majesty's ship "Perseus" could remain for a few days in the neighbourhood of Turbah or Perim it would greatly assist me in obtaining settlement.

No. 30.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 24.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, March 13, 1905.

THE acceptance of the arrangement of the Aden question as proposed in your telegram No. 50 of the 11th instant, is approved by His Majesty's Government.

20°

No. 30°.

*Foreign Office to India Office.**Foreign Office, March 13, 1905.*

Sir,

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th ultimo, relative to the French Vice-Consul at Muscat.

It appears from that letter that His Majesty's Consul at Muscat, having heard of secret arrangements made by M. Billecocq to travel overland to Sur, brought the matter to the notice of the Sultan, and that His Highness, acting apparently on Major Grey's advice, is endeavouring to prevent M. Billecocq from undertaking this journey.

Lord Lansdowne is not aware that the relations of His Majesty's Government with Muscat are of a kind to justify the British Consul in pressing the Sultan to refuse to the French Vice-Consul facilities for touring, which the British Representative would presumably expect to receive as a matter of course. It seems to his Lordship that Major Grey's action will inevitably become known to the French Government; that it will be impossible to deny that he has interfered; and that His Majesty's Government will be placed in the disagreeable position of having either to claim rights which, to the best of his Lordship's belief, they do not possess, or to admit that their Representative has been more zealous than discreet.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GORST.

No. 31.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 14.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 14th March, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 14, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 31.

Mr. Fitzmaurice to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 5.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 14, 1905.

WITH reference to your Excellency's telegram No. 3, the only place near Turba which is practicable while present monsoon lasts is Sheikh Saïd; and that would seem to be excluded in view of susceptibilities of the French. Your Excellency will be best able to judge of the effect likely to be produced at Constantinople by notification to Porte of the fact that, and the reason why, British war-ship is here at Perim; the local effect of ship's remaining here will not be appreciable.

(Repeated to Foreign Secretary, Government of India, and Secretary of State.)

No. 32

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 14.)

(No. 52.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 14, 1905.

ADEN delimitation. Immediate.

With reference to your Lordship's telegram No. 24 of yesterday's date, and my telegram No. 51 of the same date, I venture to think that it is not desirable that the Turkish Ambassador should know that proposals have been approved by your Lordship until I have succeeded in extracting an official note from the Porte recording arrangement.

Provided His Majesty's ship "Perseus" remains for a few days in the neighbourhood of Perim, I am confident of securing a speedy and satisfactory conclusion of negotiations.

No. 33.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 14.)

(No. 53.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 14, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 51 of yesterday, respecting Aden, copies of instructions sent to authorities of Yemen for delimitation of southern and north-eastern frontier have just been sent to me by Turkish Government in a *note verbale*.

It is unnecessary to detain "Perseus" in view of satisfactory nature of these instructions.

I have informed Fitzmaurice of this.

No. 34.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.(No. 25.)
(Telegraphic.) P.*Foreign Office, March 14, 1905.*

YEMEN insurrection.

With reference to Mr. Townley's telegram No. 44 of the 25th ultimo, the Kaïmakam of Kataba was still at Kataba on the 28th ultimo, while the Imam was said to be at Yarim.

Instructions have been sent to the Resident at Aden to afford the Kaïmakam and any other refugees who may be compelled to take refuge in Amiri territory a good reception on behalf of His Majesty's Government at Dthala, and, pending further orders, to pass them on to Aden.

Intimation will, if necessary, be conveyed to Imam that our boundary must be respected, as there must be no excuse for him to attack or pursue within our limits.

Kaïmakam will also be informed that our territory cannot be made a base for any operations against Imam.

No. 35.

*Foreign Office to Admiralty.**Foreign Office, March 14, 1905.*

Sir,

WITH reference to your letter of the 11th instant, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you herewith, to be laid before the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, copies of two telegrams from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople,* stating that it would be of great assistance to him in obtaining a settlement of the Aden frontier question if His Majesty's ship "Perseus" could remain in the neighbourhood of Turba or Perim for a few days.

I am to request that you will move the Lords Commissioners to cause orders to be sent to His Majesty's ship "Perseus" in the sense desired by Sir N. O'Connor, should they see no objection.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 36.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 15.)

WITH reference to this Office letter of the 11th instant, the Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 14th March, relative to the Muscat arbitration.

India Office, March 15, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 36.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 14, 1905.

MUSCAT arbitration. Your telegram of the 10th March.

Report has been called for at earliest possible date from Lorimer, who has just completed tour in Muscat and on pirate coast, in connection with Gazetteer. We are sending by next mail a copy of his preliminary précis, which contains exhaustive lists of authorities, besides other information. We will endeavour to send maps which are

* Nos. 29 and 32.

required. In the meantime we would invite attention to the following papers bearing on the question of the limits of Oman:—

1. Government of India letter dated the 23rd October, 1902, Secret, and its inclosures.

2. Administration Report, Bushire and Muscat, for the year 1878-79, p. 117.

Definition of Sultan's territories would, however, be attended by difficulties indicated in Government of India letter of the 23rd October, 1902, above cited; and we think it would be preferable, if possible, to avoid such definition and to resist discussion of the question at The Hague, if possible, on the ground that it is irrelevant to the issue before the Tribunal. It seems advisable merely to explain that the territories of the Trucial Chiefs do not form part of the dominions of the Sultan of Muscat, and to refer in this connection to our Treaties with the Chiefs, most of which are anterior in date to the Anglo-French Declaration of 1862.

No. 37.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 15.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 13th March, relative to the affairs of South-West Arabia.

India Office, March 15, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 37.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, March 13, 1905.

ADEN. His Majesty's Government concur in the proposals, reported in your telegram of the 7th March, as to Turkish refugees.

No. 38.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 26.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, March 15, 1905.

I CONGRATULATE you on the success of your negotiations as reported in your telegram No. 53 of yesterday.

I have informed the Admiralty that the instructions which had been issued to His Majesty's ship "Perseus" to remain in the vicinity of Aden may now be cancelled.

No. 39.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to M. Cambon.

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, March 15, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 6th ultimo on the subject of the Arbitration now pending before The Hague Tribunal in regard to the Muscat dhows.

Your Excellency states that the French Government have observed with some surprise that the British Case is stated to be presented in the name of the Sultan of Muscat as well as in that of His Majesty's Government; and you add that the French Government are unable to agree to the introduction of the name of His Highness as one of the parties to the discussion which is about to take place before the Tribunal.

I would ask your Excellency to point out to the French Government that the terms of the Compromis signed on the 13th October last distinctly indicate that the

Sultan of Muscat is the party primarily interested in the solution of the questions at issue.

His Highness would therefore clearly appear to have a moral right to be heard on the subject, either by representing his own Case to the Tribunal or by intrusting his interests to the care of one of the parties to the Arbitration.

His Majesty's Government will be prepared to maintain and to prove by documentary evidence that the Sultan has elected to commit his cause to their care, of his own free will, and not, as is implied in the case presented by the French Government, in consequence of any pressure put upon him by the British authorities.

It was for these reasons that His Majesty's Government considered that the case which they have put forward should be presented in the name of the Sultan as well as in their own.

They do not, however, regard it as essential that the name of His Highness should appear as one of the plaintiffs in the suit, and they will, in deference to the views of the French Government, omit it in the further documents to be presented to the Court at The Hague.

His Majesty's Government propose to forward copies of your Excellency's note and of this reply to the Tribunal.

I have, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 40.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 89.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 15, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador told me to-day, with reference to his conversation with me on the 8th instant, that the building which was said to have been erected by the orders of the Officers Commanding the British ships which had lately visited Bahrein had been put up, not on the island of that name, but on the mainland opposite Menama. This country formed part of the Turkish Empire, and the Turkish Government regarded the erection of buildings upon it as wholly unjustifiable.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 41.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir F. Bertie.

(No. 117 A.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 15, 1905.

THE French Minister stated to-day that, according to the information received by the French Government, Chief Justice Melville Fuller, the Arbitrator appointed by His Majesty's Government in the Muscat Arbitration, was totally unacquainted with the French language.

M. Delcassé was prepared, in order to facilitate the course of the pleadings before the Tribunal at The Hague, and for the convenience of the Representative chosen by His Majesty's Government, to agree to the use of the English and French languages concurrently. The concession was not, however, to be understood as creating a precedent.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 42.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 15, 1905.

I HAVE laid before the Marquess of Lansdowne your letter of the 8th instant respecting the insurrection in the Yemen and the orders which the Government of

Bombay have issued to the Resident at Aden, in view of the probability that the Kaimakam of Kataba will be compelled to seek refuge in Amiri territory.

Lord Lansdowne concurs with the Secretary of State for India in approving the instructions issued to the Resident.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 43.

Foreign Office to Admiralty.

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 15, 1905.

WITH reference to my letter of yesterday's date, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you herewith copy of a further telegram from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople,* stating that the Porte have issued satisfactory instructions with regard to the delimitation of the Aden frontier, and that it is therefore unnecessary to detain His Majesty's ship "Perseus" in the neighbourhood of Turba or Perim.

In the circumstances I am to request that the orders which it was proposed to send to His Majesty's ship "Perseus" may be suspended.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 44.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 16.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 9th February, relative to the Bahrein Customs.

India Office, March 15, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 44.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, December 17, 1904.

WITH reference to the despatch to the Secretary of State for India, of which a copy was received with Foreign Department indorsement dated the 22nd June, 1904, I have the honour to forward a copy with inclosures of a communication received from Captain Prideaux on the subject of the Bahrein Customs Farm.

2. I submit it especially at this juncture in order that the Government of India may have the last information on this subject at hand for parallel consideration with other reports on Bahrein affairs submitted by the same mail under Residency, dated the 17th December, 1904.

3. Captain Prideaux' observations at the end of paragraph 3 of his covering letter need some comment.

Sheikh Isa did actually address a letter to Colonel Meade on the 4th February, 1899, which I note that the latter considered to embody a promise that "he (Sheikh Isa) would consult the Resident as to the future arrangements to be made." I have no doubt the Chief gave Colonel Meade a verbal undertaking to that effect, but so

* No. 33.

[1517]

H

much cannot be got out of the Arabic passage itself, which is worded ambiguously, and literally translated runs as follows:—

"Please God after the expiry of the period above mentioned, and after (arriving at) unanimity of opinion, we, your friend, will explain to you regarding this subject."

It is not clear whether the "unanimity of opinion" points to Resident or to the Sheikh's relations.

Inclosure 2 in No. 44.

Captain Prideaux to Major Cox.

Bahrein, December 9, 1904.

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with this office letter, dated the 13th February, 1904, I have the honour to inclose for your information copies of letters which have passed between the Chief of Bahrein and myself, and the Hindu Syndicate who now hold the customs farm on the subject of the reformation of the system of customs administration in Bahrein.

2. I believe that the Chief of Bahrein and his family are in dread lest the Government of India propose to place the islands on the same footing as Zanzibar, with the attendant consequences connected with the liberation of slaves.

3. With regard to my verbal conversation with Sheikh Isa on the subject of the customs, I regret to state that the Chief vehemently declared to me that he had never given any promise to a British officer that he would consult the Resident in the Persian Gulf before renewing the lease of his customs again, and he asked me whether I could produce any document disproving this declaration.

There can be no doubt that the Chief's statement is untrue, but I think we have only the reports of three or four British officers to prove the contrary, and that no actual promise in writing does exist.

4. As, however, the Chief has now declared in writing that he intends to administer the customs himself on the conclusion of the Bunniah's lease, I have not thought it necessary at present, in view of my recent arrival in Bahrein, to press him further in the matter. I look upon it as unfortunate that I should have had to open this subject so soon, but my hand was forced by the fact that the Chief had himself been pressing the Bunniahs to lend him more money on a further renewal of their lease before the commencement of Ramzan.

Inclosure 3 in No. 44.

Captain Prideaux to Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali.

Bahrein, October 26, 1904.

YOU have asked me, in connection with our conversation of this morning, to write to you on the subject of the wish of the Government of India, that the customs administration in Bahrein should be placed on the modern European system, such as has been introduced with great advantage into so many Asiatic kingdoms—Persia, China, Korea, Siam, and Japan—of late years.

2. My Government believe that, if you take this step, the revenue you will receive from the Customs Department will be at least double the amount which the Bunniahs pay you now. It is not desired that you should suffer the slightest loss either of dignity or of income, and the Government are confident that on your accepting their advice both your authority over the people of Bahrein—tribesmen as well as townsmen—and your wealth and comfort will increase.

3. You are not asked to hand over the administration of the customs to the Government of India, nor to promise always to employ a British official. You are only urged to give the European system a trial, and, as none of your subjects have a knowledge of that system, to borrow for the introduction of it, temporarily, an official from India who shall have had a training in customs work.

4. I can assure you that all the profits reaped will be handed over to you direct by the Customs Superintendent, and that this agency has no desire that any of the money should pass through its office.

5. With regard to your indebtedness to the present Hindu farmers of the customs, I hope you will give me a clear statement, and I am confident that the Government of India will authorize me to negotiate a settlement with them, satisfactory both to yourself and the Bunniahs, and, if need be, the Government will sanction my making you an immediate advance of money to preserve you from inconvenience, whilst the new arrangements are taking shape.

6. I am looking forward to a reply from you which shall give a further proof of your friendly sentiments towards my Government, and of your readiness to trust in the wisdom of its advice.

Inclosure 4 in No. 44.

Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali to Captain Prideaux.

20th Shaban, 1322 (October 30, 1904).

I RECEIVED your letter dated the 26th October, 1904, the contents of which I understood, and I thank you for the advice you give me therein.

Regarding the subject of the Bahrein customs administration, I beg to say that, as soon as the present contracts with the Bunniahs expire, I shall appoint my own men to administer the customs, and shall not again lease the same to Bunniahs.

Inclosure 5 in No. 44.

Captain Prideaux to Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali.

Bahrein, October 31, 1904.

I HAVE received your letter dated the 30th October, 1904 (20th Shaban, 1322), and am glad to hear that you do not again intend to farm out your customs.

2. For the reasons mentioned in my letter of the 26th October, 1904 (16th Shaban, 1322), I am sorry that you do not at present propose to recover the sovereign rights over the customs which you have transferred to the Bunniahs, and I am hopeful that, before the existing leases expire, you will have recognized the advisability of following the course recommended to you by the Government of India.

Inclosure 6 in No. 44.

Captain Prideaux to Customs Farmers.

Bahrein, October 31, 1904.

WITH reference to our conversations of the 17th and (25th) October, 1904, on the subject of the leases of the 4 per cent. and 1 per cent. customs duties which you hold from the Sheikh of Bahrein up to the 7th January, 1908 (30th Zilkaada, 1325), and 25th April, 1906 (8th Safar, 1324), respectively, when you informed me that Sheikh Isa was again in want of a further advance of money, and you consulted me on the propriety of acceding to his request, I have thought it advisable to repeat in writing what I then told you—viz., that the Government of India have hopes that the Chief of Bahrein will, in the near future, reform his system of customs administration, and will apply to the Government for the loan of an official to introduce the desirable amendments.

In these circumstances, while the Government will give you all due support in your existing transactions with the Chief, you must not expect that they will further regard your claims if you persist in negotiating for another renewal of your farm of the customs. I am now further able to inform you that Sheikh Isa has recently written to me that he will not again allow his customs to be farmed out after the expiry of the present leases.

An early acknowledgment of this letter is requested.

Inclosure 7 in No. 44.

Customs Farmers to Captain Prideaux.

Bahrein, November 1, 1904.

WE acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, and beg to state that whatever transactions regarding customs have been made before this you are well aware of, and after this we will not make any transactions with the Sheikh without your permission and knowledge.

No. 45.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 17.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 17th March, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 17, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 45.

Mr. Fitzmaurice to India Office.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 17, 1905.

ADEN delimitation.

I have received the following telegram, No. 6, dated the 16th March, from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople:—

"I am sending you by mail of the 21st instant a copy of the instructions sent by the Turkish Government on the 13th instant, through Hodeida, to their Commissioner. It is needless for me to urge upon you the importance of proceeding, at the earliest possible date, with the delimitation of the Mudariba-Sheikh Mirad section of the frontier."

I have to-day sent the following telegram, No. 6, to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople:—

"I should be glad to be informed whether the Turkish Government's note, to which reference is made in your Excellency's telegram No. 5, is regarded as satisfactory in respect of our lien on territory and the boundary north-east. If so, it would not be necessary to await the copy of instructions which is being sent to me by mail, as immediately instructions reach Turkish Commissioner I could settle with him outstanding boundary to Sheikh Mirad and sign accordingly. Have I authority to do this?"

"I presume instructions mentioned in your Excellency's telegram No. 6 were communicated to Turkish Commissioner by telegraph."

"I am repeating this telegram to the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy."

No. 46.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 17.)

(No. 159. Cypher despatch.) P.

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 13, 1905.

I HAVE received the following telegram from His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah, No. 19, of the 12th instant:—

"Confidential. Meeting of Vali, Sheikh of Koweit and Ibn Saoud's father. My telegram No. 17 of the 23rd February."

28*

No. 44*.

Sir A. Hardinge to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 16.)

(No. 33.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, March 16, 1905.

STATUS of Koweit Arabs in Persia. Your telegrams Nos. 7 and 17 of the 9th and 24th ultimo.

Following telegram repeated to India:—

"I hear from M. Naus that instructions given to Customs officials were due to orders issued by Mushir-ed-Dowleh, to whom I spoke in sense of your instructions. He informed me that the Porte had protested against our Resident at Bushire interfering in Koweit cases, and that he himself had made inquiries through the Persian Embassy at Constantinople. As a result, the above action had been taken. However, he seemed ready to admit that, *de facto*, Koweit was independent of Turkey, and when I proposed that Koweit subjects should be treated on the same lines as Afghans in Persia, he promised to submit the matter to the Shah. He asked me what view other Powers took of the status of Koweit, which makes me think that, before replying to me definitely, he may consult other, *e.g.*, the French and German, Representatives here. I evaded answering this question directly."

"I believe the following information to be correct:

"Vali proposed to Sheikh in second meeting that some Ottoman troops, a post-office, a sanitary office, should be established in Koweit. This was refused by the Sheikh. The Vali sent a letter to the Sheikh on the 14th February telling him to accept proposals (meaning probably these verbal ones) and to stop foreign influence. Vali also wrote to Ibn Saoud's father telling him to offer his submission to the Mushir, and that all would be well if he did this.

"Vali has received a reply from Ibn Saoud's father asking that a letter of recommendation to the Mushir may be sent him. The Sheikh has not replied."

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 47.

Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley.—(Received at Foreign Office, March 18.)

(No. 8. Confidential.)

Sir,

Bussorah, February 24, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 7 of the 18th instant, respecting affairs of Nejd and Koweit, I have the honour to report further what follows:—

As to the expedition of last summer and autumn, my military informant now says that he was mistaken in his statement that in December there were 4,000 Turkish soldiers still near Hail. He says that the real number was about 2,400; that the original expedition consisted of exactly that number of infantry, viz., four battalions of 600 men each with six guns; that only about 300 men were lost, and that some reinforcements had probably come from Medina.

I give his statements merely for what they may be worth. According to what is generally believed here they are not truthful. The impression here still is that only 600 or 700 men were left near Hail, and nothing appears to be known of reinforcements from Medina.

As to the numbers of the expedition which is now on its way to, or has already arrived at Kasim (the district of Aneyza, Boreyda, and Al Ruso), I have no precise information; they have perhaps been reported from Bagdad.

The following telegram, dated the 1st January, 1905, was sent by the Mushir, Nejed to the Vali, Bussorah:—

"Sixteen battalions are being collected at Nejed; eight battalions are now being sent on the expedition to provide for the needs of those eight before they move; one month's pay is to be given to each according to the Imperial Irade of the 28th December, and special bills or orders for payment are being sent to the Bagdad and Bussorah Vilayets; 100,000 piastres is the share of the Bussorah Vilayet. Please draw this amount from the Bussorah Treasury and send it by telegraphic order."

On the 13th instant, the following telegram was sent from the Ministry of Finance, Constantinople, to the Defterdar (Treasurer), Bussorah:—

"For four battalions of the 6th Army Corps, about to be sent to Kasim, deficiencies of one month's pay and provisions amount to 87,960 piastres. Send as already ordered of this amount the part allotted to battalions going from Bussorah Vilayets."

I do not clearly understand in this second telegram whether the 87,960 piastres means one month's pay and rations for four battalions, and whether any of these four battalions are fresh ones or they had already all been collected at Nejed. I have heard precisely of only two battalions having been sent from the Bussorah Vilayet, as I have had the honour to report in my telegrams No. 70 of the 31st December, and No. 1 of the 7th January.

I have heard vaguely that some troops (perhaps two battalions) were sent from the Merntefik Sandjak of this vilayet, and that there was an extraordinary number of desertions on that occasion. However, it seems clear from the two telegrams that it was intended to send at least eight battalions of infantry, and I hear also of six guns and about 400 mule cavalry. I have heard that the force, or part of it, was about a fortnight ago at Wakisah Wells, about 100 miles on the road from Nejed to Kasim, but I have heard practically nothing further of its march towards Kasim, since a part of it left Nejed about the end of January, parts of it having, it seems, left earlier.

The Vali has now informed me that the expedition is to be a peaceful one, and that a Mutessarif, and other officials for Kasim, will follow, as they have been

accepted by Ibn Saoud's father, Abdurrahman, in the two meetings of the 8th and 13th instant respectively, which I have reported. The Vali says that Abdurrahman requested of him the favour of an interview, complaining that Ibn Rashid was listened to by the Turkish Government while he himself, though loyal, had never been heard; and that he (the Vali) obtained the necessary permission from Constantinople, and the meetings took place accordingly with a satisfactory result. My information, however, of the correctness of which I have no doubt, is that the first overtures came from Acting Vali Fakhri Pasha at the end of October as I have reported. The unsubmissive telegram of Abdurrahman, reported in my despatch above referred to, was not in reply to the letter of Fakhri Pasha. This telegram, and the one from the Kaimakam of Katr, which is reported in the same despatch, were handed into the Fao office on the 18th November, were kept in Bussorah about a fortnight, during which time the Vali was no doubt telegraphically corresponding with Constantinople, and were finally sent on to the Palace about the end of November.

Abdurrahman's equally unsubmissive letter, reported in the same despatch, was received here on the 5th or 6th December, and may have been in reply in Fakhri Pasha's letter, though I have not heard that there was anything in it about the meeting proposed by Fakhri Pasha. Further correspondence passed, with the details of which I am not acquainted, and about the beginning or middle of January a letter was received by the Vali from Sheikh Mubarek asking about a proposed meeting of Abdurrahman and the Sheikh with the Vali.

Abdurrahman came to or near Koweit and sent a message to the Vali proposing a meeting on the Koweit-Bussorah boundary. The Vali wished the meeting-place to be near the town of Bussorah, but the Sheikh and Abdurrahman seem to have objected that there was no good pasturage near the town for the many horses and camels they had with them. The two were also no doubt afraid of Arab enemies and Turkish authorities. The telegram of the 21st January from the Mushir at Nejed to the Vali, of the *en clair* part of which I have telegraphed the substance, probably contained something about the meeting.

The *en clair* Arabic part consists of Koranic phrases promising in the Sultan's name pardon for past offences, and exhorting Mussulmans to submit to good government, beware of infidels, and not fight among themselves. This was *en clair*, probably because there is no cypher for such Arabic words. It has not yet, so far as I know, been sent to Nejd. The Mushir wanted copies of it to be given for transmission to Nejd or Kasim to two partisans of Ibn Saoud, but they had a few days before been sent off in exile to Constantinople, as I have reported. He wished another copy to be given to some partisans of Ibn Rashid who were in Bussorah, but they refused to take it. No trustworthy person could, it is said, be found to take charge of it. It was, I believe, sent to Koweit.

The Sheikh of Koweit's telegram of the 29th January to the Vali says:—

"Abdurrahman will be here in six days. I will inform you of his coming, and he will confirm what I have said about his loyalty."

The Sheikh, however, himself signed this "Ruler of Koweit and Chief of its tribes." Finally, the two meetings of the three took place (8th and 13th February), each at about 30 miles distance from Bussorah town, within the Vilayet of Bussorah. The second meeting-place was a few hours away from the first, but no nearer Bussorah town. The Sheikh and Abdurrahman were wandering about for pasturage and, it is said, hawking. With the Vali there were present at the meetings only the Mektubji (Secretary) and the Assistant Secretary of the vilayet. The latter has been talking to several persons, of whom one has directly reported his account of the first meeting to my Dragoman, and from another a similar account of the first meeting has reached my Dragoman indirectly through a third person. The Vali has given much the same account to me. It appears then that Abdurrahman expressed readiness to accept civil officials, a Mutessarif, and so forth, and garrisons in Kasim, though he protested against expense being entailed by the garrisons, but that he will have none of Ibn Rashid's interference. The Vali has told someone here that he, the Vali, reproved Sheikh Mubarek in the first meeting for signing "Ruler and Chief," but that the Sheikh would not agree to sign as Kaimakam. The Vali, after the first meeting, expressed himself to my Dragoman in violent language against the Sheikh as a "pig," who would not allow the telegraph to Koweit or a postal service to pass through his territory to the south.

I have not been able to learn what passed at the second meeting. Immediately after it the Vali sent to Koweit a written message, which probably, from what I hear,

contained a written Imperial pardon for Abdurrahman and his son. The Vali has telegraphed to the Sheikh (as "Kaimakam of Koweit," it may be noted) demanding urgently a reply to "letters," meaning, no doubt, to this message, which may also have contained something else of importance.

The Sheikh of Koweit's Agent now walks about the town every day accompanied by a prison officer of the rank of lieutenant in the army, with whom he sleeps in a privileged room of the prison. I suppose that he will soon be released altogether unless the Sultan's wrath is excited afresh. This Consulate never hears a word from him now, and he seems disinclined even to salute my Dragoman, towards whom his demeanour used to be very different.

I would add that it does not appear that the Vali gave any decisive answer at either meeting, or that any result has yet been arrived at.

I have, &c.

(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

No. 48.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 18, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd February relative to Koweit.

The matters discussed in the first five paragraphs of the despatch from the Government of India inclosed in that letter were fully dealt with in the letter from this Department of the 25th November, 1904, the seventh paragraph of which was as follows:—

"When, therefore, the Government of India suggested, in their telegram of the 20th May, 1904, that the moment was opportune for the dispatch of an officer to Koweit, His Majesty's Government gave their sanction to the proposal, but they certainly did not intend that there should be any departure from the conditions upon which they had originally insisted. The most important of these conditions was that the officer should be withdrawn after a reasonable interval."

I am to state that Lord Lansdowne, while unable to admit the correctness of the inference described in paragraph 3 of the despatch from the Government of India, does not consider that there would be any advantage in further pursuing the discussion of the subject.

His Lordship sees no objection to the suggestions of the Government of India as to the means for effecting the temporary withdrawal of Captain Knox from Koweit.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 49.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 20.)

(No. 165.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 14, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a despatch from Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell, Military Attaché to this Embassy, reporting on further reinforcements for the Yemen from Syria, and forwarding the distribution table for the Syrian Corps and Hejaz Divisions.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 48.

Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell to Sir N. O'Connor.(No. 7.)
Sir,

Constantinople, March 13, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that, owing to the seriousness of the insurrection in the Yemen, it has been decided to call out eight more battalions of Redifs—which comprise the Akka (Saint-Jean d'Acre) Brigade—making a total of thirty-two battalions on their way to reinforce the Sanaa Relief Expedition under Ali Riza Pasha.

I beg to attach a distribution table of troops in the 5th (Syrian) Corps, and have marked in red troops which have left or are leaving for the Yemen.

When they all arrive at Hodeida these reinforcements will amount to 25,000 men.

Further, a force of 1,000 recruits and drafts to make up the strength of the Nizam battalions in the Yemen, these to be collected from Adalia and various ports on the Syrian Coast.

In Constantinople, the Government Mahsusse Company having failed to produce serviceable steamers for transports, all their spare boats being under repairs, the Minister of War has had to arrange with private shipping Companies here for six transports to load stores and then collect men at the various Syrian ports.

Two field batteries and one mountain mortar, the latter recently obtained on trial from Krupp, together with 20,000 large calibre Mauser rifles and a quantity of food supplies, flour, &c., are being shipped here, after which the vessels will leave for Syria.

Attached also is a distribution table,* of the 16th (Hejaz) Division, which includes the troops at Medina, from whence four battalions have just left for Kassim to assist Ibn Rashid.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. R. MAUNSELL, *Lieutenant-Colonel,*
Military Attaché.

No. 50.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 20.)(No. 166.)
My Lord,

Constantinople, March 14, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a despatch, from Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell, Military Attaché to this Embassy, forwarding the distribution table of the 6th (Bagdad) Corps and a list of Arab tribes in the Bagdad Vilayet.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure 1 in No. 50.

Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell to Sir N. O'Connor.(No. 8.)
Sir,

Constantinople, March 13, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward a distribution table of the troops in the 6th (Bagdad) Order.*

The force under Mushir Feizi Pasha, marching towards Ha'il, now consists of six battalions (4,000 men), two having been sent back, probably owing to the difficulty of providing transport for the force.

The expedition from Medina, consisting of four battalions (3,000 men) under Sidki Pasha, has at last left that place, and will co-operate with the Mushir from that side.

There is as yet no definite news of Feizi Pasha's arrival at Kassim, but apparently he is experiencing some difficulties as regards transport, as urgent requisition has been made for 2,000 more riding camels ("akil").

* Not printed.

Major Newmarch has just sent me a list of the principal Arab tribes on the Euphrates, which I beg also to inclose, as it may be of interest at the present time.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. R. MAUNSELL, *Lieutenant-Colonel,*
Military Attaché.

Inclosure 2 in No. 50.

Arab Tribes in the Bagdad Vilayet.

SHAMMAR.

Principal Sheikh	Mijwal Beg.
				Assi.
				Shallal.
				Tahir.
				Mutlek.
Minor Sheikh	Abdul Aziz.
				Faisal.
				Wahayib.
				Sultan.

They are all the sons of the late Ferhan Pasha. Mijwal, as the eldest son, is the recognized Chief of the clan. He has received the title of "Beg" from the Osmanli, and with the title an allowance of £ T. 200 per annum.

They number about 2,000 tents and 5,000 men. They can place 4,000 horsemen in the field. They are said to possess about 200 Martini rifles, otherwise they are armed with spears.

Their principal head-quarters are in the Shamiyah, but they travel for pasture to Mosul, Sinjar, Karbala, Nejef, and Koot.

They are great horse-breeders, and they also breed camels and sheep. At Karbala and Nejef they purchase wheat, barley, and dates, and they also dispose of their camels, horses, sheep, and ghee there.

Sheikh Assi's men have taken to cultivation. They occupy lands near the Dujail Canal, where they also breed sheep, and they are said to be more peaceably disposed than the other members of the clan.

BENI LAM.

Principal Sheikh	Bejnayah ibn Ghalliban.
Minor Sheikh	Humaid ibn Thaamir.

There are four or five other minor Sheikhs, but they are not considered men of importance, and their names are unknown here.

They number about 5,000 men and have 1,000 huts. They can put 3,000 horsemen in the field armed with Martini and other rifles.

They are generally to be found between Koot and Amarah, and from Koot to the Persian frontier, under Hassan Kuli Khan.

They are freebooters, speak Persian, Kurdish, and Arabic. What they steal in Turkish territory they sell in Persia and *vice versa*.

SHAMMAR TOGA.

They are a sept of the great Shammar tribe or nation, who have separated themselves from the main stock and have settled below Ctesiphon. They were originally of the Sunni faith, but now profess the Shiah tenets.

Their principal and only Shiekh is Kushmoor. They have about 400 tents and can turn out about 100 horsemen. They number in all about 400.

They are agriculturists, and about half their number are now employed by Kadhim Pasha as cultivators on his lands near Ctesiphon. It is said that Kadhim Pasha protects them from the rapacity of the tax-collectors and recruiting sergeants, and that the Shammar Toga appear to be better off since taking service under Kadhim Pasha than formerly.

[1517]

K

ZUBAID.

Principal Sheikh	Reshid Beg ibn Berbooth.
Minor Sheikh	Muhayil ibn Mahsan.

There are about ten other minor Sheikhs, but of no great importance, whose names are not known.

They have 4,000 tents, and can place about 5,000 horsemen in the field armed with Martini and other rifles. They number in all about 8,000 men.

They are to be met with from Bagdad down to a little above Goornah.

They are agriculturists, and they possess camels, buffaloes, cows, and sheep.

No. 51.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 20.)

(No. 168.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 14, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to confirm my telegram No. 53 of to-day's date to your Lordship, and to inclose herewith copies of a *note verbale* which I have just received from the Sublime Porte, inclosing officially copies of the instructions sent to the authorities of the Yemen in respect to the delimitation of the frontier of the Subaihi, from Mudariba to Sheikh Mirad, as also for the prosecution in due course of the delimitation of the frontier between the Yaffai and the Yemen, from the Bana River north-east to the desert.

These instructions are substantially in conformity with our demands, and as they leave no room for doubt that the Yaffai is one of the Nine Cantons, they are particularly satisfactory.

I have had to put considerable pressure upon the Ottoman Government to obtain this result, and the presence of His Majesty's ship "Perseus" in the neighbourhood of Turba afforded valuable assistance, for which I am grateful.

I have, as already reported to your Lordship, informed Mr. Fitzmaurice that, as far as my negotiations with the Porte are concerned, it is unnecessary to detain the ship any longer in that neighbourhood.

I trust that no unnecessary delay will now occur in furnishing Mr. Fitzmaurice with the escort which he will require to delimitate the southern frontier. The season is already far advanced, and every day's delay will add to the physical difficulties of executing the work, and to the danger to be apprehended from the climate.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure 1 in No. 51.

Note communicated by the Ottoman Government to Sir N. O'Connor.

EN réponse à la note verbale que l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté Britannique a bien voulu lui adresser en date du 10 Mars, le Ministère des Affaires Étrangères a l'honneur de lui transmettre ci-près copie des instructions données par la Sublime Porte au Département Impérial de la Guerre, pour être communiquées télégraphiquement aux Commissaires Ottomans, et du télégramme qu'elle vient d'expédier au Gouverneur-Général du Yemen relativement à la délimitation des cantons de Subaihi et de Yaffai.

Le 14 Mars, 1905.

Inclosure 2 in No. 51.

Grand Vizier to the Minister of War.

(Translation.)

Excency, 4 Muharrem, 1323 (March 11, 1905).
IN continuation of my despatch of the 22nd Shewal, 1322 (29th December, 1904).

The tenour of the Imperial Iradé, which was issued to sanction the decision of the Council of Ministers concerning the transmission of instructions to the Ottoman Commissioners in regard to the settlement of the frontier of the Canton Subaihi by a line drawn to the coast of the Sea of Aden outside Bab-el-Mandeb, leaving Turba and its wells and the territory up to a line ending at Sheikh Mirad on the side of the Yemen, so as to expedite the termination of the affair of the frontier of the Nine Cantons, was communicated also to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

I send to your Excellency herewith inclosed a despatch which has been received from that Department stating that the British Embassy calls its attention to the failure to commence this work, and urges that the demarcation of this section of the frontier should be commenced, and also that speedy endeavour should be made to settle the frontier to the north-east, relating to the four uzles of Dhabiani, Juban, Naawa, and Rubiatein, which are considered by the British Government as dependencies of Yaffai, in accordance with the Imperial Iradé previously communicated.

As the Imperial Iradé issued in regard to the manner of delimiting the frontier of the Subaihi canton was communicated to your Excellency on the 22nd Shewal, 1322 (29th December, 1904), and that issued in regard to the frontier-line to be drawn from Lakmet-esh-Shoub north-east to the desert was likewise communicated on the 30th January, 1318 (12th February, 1903), and as the section from Lakmet-esh-Shoub to the Yaffai has already been completed, you will be good enough to send me immediately a copy of the telegram to be dispatched for the purpose of transmitting to our Commissioners definite instructions as to immediately setting to work, in accordance with the Imperial Iradé to speedily complete the settlement of the Subaihi frontier, as before said, in such a manner that the fort and village of Turba, with its wells, and the territory up to the line ending at Sheikh Mirad, shall remain on the side of the Yemen, and that it is part of the agreement that this territory shall never be given up by the Imperial Government to any other Power, and subsequently to set to work likewise on the formalities connected with the section relating to the Yaffai, in conformity with the Imperial Iradé, and of making a similar communication to that effect to the Vali also, and you will return the inclosed despatch.

(Signed) GRAND VIZIER.

Inclosure 3 in No. 51.

Instructions from the Ottoman Government to the Vilayet of Yemen.

(Translation.)

IT having been decided, in agreement with the British Embassy, to draw the frontier-line relating to that section of the Canton Subaihi, one of the Nine Cantons, which ends at the coast, down to Sheikh Mirad, on the condition that the fort and village of Turba, its wells, and the territory up to the line ending at Sheikh Mirad, remain on the side of the Yemen, and that this territory shall not hereafter be ceded by the Imperial Government to any other Power, and an Imperial Iradé having been promulgated in accordance therewith, you will transmit to our Commissioners immediate instructions to complete with celerity the formalities in regard to this section, and subsequently to set to work on the settlement of the Yaffai frontier, in accordance with the Imperial Iradé previously communicated,* and expedite the termination of these operations.

* i.e., February 1903.

No. 52.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 20.)

(No. 170.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 14, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith a copy of a Memorandum by Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell, Military Attaché to the Embassy, containing a summary of the events in the Yemen insurrection.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 52.

Summary of Events in the Yemen Insurrection of 1904-1905 up to March 14, 1905.

DISCONTENT and minor disturbances against Turkish rule have been chronic in the Yemen since the last serious insurrection was suppressed in 1899.

Last spring the old leader, Sheikh Hamid-ed-Din, who lived at Saada and was leader of the Zaidi sect, died, and was succeeded by Muhammad Yahia, his son, a young and energetic man, who woke the smouldering embers of revolt, and has been the direct cause of kindling the present flame.

The outbreak took the Turks by surprise. The garrisons, besides that of Sanaa and a few other places, such as Hajje Hajjeir and Taiz, were scattered in small detachments and posts throughout the country with long lines of communications through hostile country.

The first serious incident was on the 8th November, 1904, when the rebels attacked the post at Hafash, the garrison of 400 being completely destroyed, no relief being possible to raise the siege in time.

This was the first blow to Turkish prestige, and led to urgent demands for reinforcements being made by the Vali.

The nearest troops were those at Kunfida, where the Adana Redif Brigade delayed on the coast since November 1903, with the intention of moving inland to Assir and punishing the tribes who had revolted there.

These were ordered to be diverted to Hodeidah. In the beginning of December the rebellion was increasing in Ar Nahieor district, and the wires were cut between Sanaa and Taiz. Urgent demands for three months' rations, ammunition, and reinforcements were sent again.

It may be added that flour and other food supplies have often to be imported from India for the troops, and last year's famine has made matters worse, and supplies were apparently wanted.

On the 12th December came the serious news that Sanaa itself was invested, the road to the coast at Hodeidah was beset by rebels, and the detached posts along it attacked.

The outskirts of Hodeidah were also attacked.

Owing to the want of troops at hand, a suggestion was made to arm the friendly tribes near Hodeidah with rifles from the dépôt there, but this was not approved of and was not carried out.

On the 24th December the dispatch of an entire Redif division from Syria was approved, the men to move by the Hejaz Railway to Maan, march thence to Akaba, where they would embark for Hodeidah, thus saving the Canal dues. The Vali of Syria entered a protest against this arrangement, as there was a want of water and accommodation at both Maan and Akaba, and the route between the two places was a difficult one.

On the 26th December the Sinan Pasha post on the Sanaa-Hodeidah road surrendered to the rebels with some small guns, while other posts were captured also.

Sanaa was now closely besieged, and a relief force of two battalions with some armed friendly natives left Hodeidah under the command of the Mutessarif, but returned after having penetrated a short distance, the friendlies being disarmed on their return.

It was decided to await the arrival of more regular troops.

On the 31st December the Mudir of the Nahie of Mahviyet, dependent on Kaukelan, was captured with his escort. Toklamish, Khamis, and the town of Tabela, with the body of troops under Colonel Edhem Bey, were obliged to surrender with other small posts. By the 6th January troops began to arrive from Confuda in "sambuks," or native boats, towed by steam-launches. Troops also prepared to be sent from Yambo in the Hejaz.

On the 10th January Sanaa was seriously attacked for six days and nights; bread was deficient in the town, but there was plenty of meat. The Vali managed to telegraph urging troops to be sent at once, saying that if the rebellion is not now checked fifty or sixty battalions will soon be necessary to quell it, and the rebels are in considerable force.

On the 14th January the first order was sent definitely to mobilize two brigades of Syrian Redifs, and prepare one brigade of eight Nizam battalions from the 5th (Syrian) Corps for immediate embarkation at Akaba for the Yemen.

On the 29th January a transport, the "Hagion Oros," a Greek vessel, was full of troops just embarked at Confuda for the Yemen, when the men mutinied, seized the captain and officers, and turned the vessel homewards.

They arrived at Suez in a state of starvation, but on payment of the Canal dues was allowed to pass through, after which they reached Mersina, their home.

Orders have been given that they are to be severely punished.

On the 7th February Aarif Pasha had organized a relief column with what troops had then come in, and on that day successfully forced his way into Sanaa.

But the rest of the country continues much disturbed by the rebels. The Jebel Ruyra post was surrounded, while the fourteen other small posts were in great danger.

Very shortly after Sanaa was entered by the relieving force, the rebels being defeated by the main force, and on the 12th February its state became worse, as it was now invested by the rebels again. This happened almost immediately after Aarif Pasha entered the town.

The post of Jibal Sharki, in the Caza of Anis, surrendered, and was counted a serious loss.

Hafah Kalezi, in the Sandjak of Hodeidah, also surrendered, and a detachment of troops in Anis Caza with guns and ammunition was captured, the officer in command being killed.

On the 19th February the troops were withdrawn from the important posts of Hajur and Tebjil. A week later the rebels raided the Cazas of Anis and Kataba; the troops retired. The want of provisions was very severely felt. Three companies of troops at Mansourie, in the Caza of Haraz, were obliged to surrender.

On the 22nd February Kataba and Ibb were besieged and communications with the Taiz Sandjak were interrupted. Anis and Verim were also blockaded, but the rebels have not yet captured the important centre of Taiz, although it seems to be surrounded.

On the 2nd March the most serious disaster for the Turks occurred in the capture of the important military centre of Hijje, north-west of Sanaa, usually garrisoned by two battalions; the Commandant (Tewfik Bey) was killed, five cannon of 8 centim. and 12 centim. were captured, with 2,000 Martinis and 2,000 cases of ammunition, after which the rebels pushed on towards Johor, which they have surrounded. This place cannot be traced on the map, but is apparently nearer to Sanaa.

On the 3rd March, the relief expedition having begun to collect at Hodeidah, Ferik Ali Riza Pasha, recently nominated to the command of the troops in the Yemen, arrived there.

He is a good soldier with plenty of energy, and the right man for the post. He was Vali of Monastir when the Russian Consul was shot there in 1903, after which he was sent to Tripoli.

The situation he found most critical at Hodeidah; help was urgently needed if Sanaa was not to fall into the hands of the enemy, and messages that got through stated that it could only hold out for ten days from about the 27th February. So desperate was the case that, even if Riza Pasha had not arrived, urgent orders had been sent to the Governor of Hodeidah to push on with whatever troops were at hand and some armed levies from the town.

It appears that Menakha, an important stronghold about half-way along the road between Hodeidah and Sanaa, still remains in Turkish hands, although it was reported fallen and may have been temporarily in the hands of the insurgents.

[1517]

L

This gives an important advantage to the Turks in their advance from the coast to Sanaa.

The road onwards between Menakha and Sanaa is undoubtedly held by the enemy, and there the principal fighting must take place.

In Sanaa itself is a force of seven battalions (3,500 men) with the former Commandant, Tewfik Pasha, the Vali, also Tewfik Pasha, and the principal officials, civil and military.

On Riza Pasha's arrival he started inland from Hodeidah immediately with seven battalions and eight mountain batteries on the 5th March to relieve Sanaa.

The force, about 4,000 men, seems rather too small to accomplish his purpose, but the Syrian reinforcements continued to arrive so slowly and the situation at Sanaa was so urgent that he was obliged to move.

Meanwhile some help had been afforded to Johor, although the siege of the place has not been raised, and the insurgents are also active in Hoshum.

The number of insurgents in the field is difficult to estimate, but 40,000 seems a reasonable estimate, which was given by a Turkish officer here.

The condition of affairs has now become so serious that another Redif brigade, that of Akka (St. Jean d'Acre), has been called out in the Syrian Corps, making a total of eight Nizam and twenty-four Redif battalions on their way from there to Hodeidah.

Transports have been most difficult to obtain, and three vessels of the Khedivie Mail Line are now embarking troops at Akaba and are on their way to Hodeidah.

Five thousand recruits and drafts are to be collected at various Syrian ports and Adalia and sent to Yemen. Six vessels have been hired from foreign Companies at Constantinople to carry these troops and stores.

Two field batteries and one mountain mortar, with 30,000 large-calibre Mauser rifles, have been shipped here and will leave shortly.

Large quantities of food supplies, flour, &c., are also being sent, as provisions are badly needed at Hodeidah.

Should Sanaa fall the effect will be serious, and there are rumours that the insurrectionary movement may spread to Mecca and Medina.

In any case, what will practically be the reconquest of the Yemen will have to be undertaken.

(Signed) F. R. MAUNSELL.

Constantinople, March 14, 1905.

No. 53.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 20.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 20th March, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 20, 1904.

Inclosure in No. 53.

Mr. Fitzmaurice to Sir N. O'Connor.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 20, 1905.

ADEN delimitation: Your Excellency's telegram No. 7.

Turkish Commissioner has not yet received the telegram from the Grand Vizier sent through the Vali of Yemen. But, in reply to the telegram sent by him, as reported in my No. 4, received on the 18th instant, communication direct from the Minister of War, stating that Commissioner's message has been communicated to the Grand Vizier; that he is now instructed to proceed with delimitation down to Sheikh Mirad; and that delimitation north-east is to be carried out in accordance with the Irade of February 1903.

No mention of the four places is made in the above communication, and Turkish Commissioner is unable to agree to insertion in *procès-verbal* of points not included in instructions he has received.

He has telegraphed to-day to his Government, through the Vali, to the following effect:—

That the Aulaki fall to the south of the line implied in the Irade of February 1903 (i.e., that they are on the British side of the line); that, while he is doubtful as to Juban, he is convinced, from information in his possession, together with proofs with which I have furnished him, that the other three places belong to Yafa; and he requests that he may be authorized to conclude settlement of north-east basis. It would seem that Juban is the stumbling-block of settlement of boundary north-east, in consequence of its being the administrative centre of a Canton.

Turkish Commissioner, in his telegram mentioned in my No. 4, reported, as an argument in favour of speedy settlement, that five British men-of-war were rumoured to be in the vicinity of Perim, and that their intentions were suspicious. Presence of so many war-ships is quite mythical.

In the same telegram he used the phrase "Kudam line" to represent the limits of the territory not to be ceded, in regard to which there is a vague reference in the *note verbale*.

(Repeated to Viceroy, Foreign Department, and Secretary of State.)

No. 54.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 20.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 20th March, relative to the Muscat arbitration.

India Office, March 20, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 54.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 20, 1905.

MUSCAT Arbitration: My telegram of the 14th instant.

Details are being sent by post regarding Lowatiyas: they are Khorassan emigrants from Sind. British protection is apparently accorded to those who left Sind after its conquest by the British.

No. 55.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 20.)

(No. 55.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 20, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 168 of the 14th instant: Aden.

To-day I have sent the following telegram to Fitzmaurice:—

"With reference to your telegram of to-day, No. 7, the Minister of War was to-day instructed by Grand Vizier, at my instigation, to authorize the insertion of our claim to the four places on the north-east boundary in the *procès-verbal* by the Turkish Commissioner.

"As, however, our claim is officially recorded, you need not insist if this point is likely to cause delay.

"In regard to signature, instructions will be sent to you later."

Can Fitzmaurice be instructed to sign if your Lordship approves?

No. 56.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 21.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Resident, Aden, dated the 20th instant, relative to the Yemen disturbances.

India Office, March 20, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 56.

Resident, Aden, to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 20, 1905.

IT is reported that Imam has captured Sanaa and Ibb, and that a portion of his force is approaching Kataba. Imam will, I am hopeful, confine his attention to the Turks, but if he does not, one or two regiments will probably be required at Aden to reinforce troops now here. Officer Commanding at Dthali has been warned to be on the alert.

(Repeated to Secretary of State, Political Department, Bombay, and Commander-in-chief in India.)

No. 57.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 21.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 21st instant, respecting Bahrein affairs.

India Office, March 21, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 57.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 21, 1905.

BAHREIN. My telegram of the 6th instant.

You will receive by mail full report of proceedings at Bahrein. Ultimatum was presented on the 24th February, but force was not resorted to as Sheikh agreed to our demands.

His Majesty's ship "Fox" has now left the island.

No. 58.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 21.)

(No. 56.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 21, 1905.

ADEN. To-day I have telegraphed to Fitzmaurice as follows:—

"With reference to your telegram of to-day, No. 8.

"I do not think we can properly ask Porte to do more than record our claim to the four places, of which very little is really known. They have, moreover, never questioned status of Aulaki Canton."

No. 59.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 21, 1905.

WITH reference to the telegram No. 53 of the 14th instant, from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, relative to the settlement of the Aden frontier, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, copy of a despatch from Sir N. O'Connor,* transmitting copy of a *note verbale* from the Sublime Porte, in which the instructions recently sent to the Turkish authorities in the Yemen regarding the delimitation of the frontier are inclosed.

I am to request that Mr. Brodrick's attention may be specially directed to the observations in the last paragraph of Sir N. O'Connor's despatch relative to the expediency of furnishing an escort for Mr. Fitzmaurice with the least possible delay.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 60.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 21, 1905.

WITH reference to my previous letter of to-day's date, on the subject of the Aden frontier, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to inclose, for the information of the Secretary of State for India, copy of a telegram from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople,† communicating a message sent to Mr. Fitzmaurice by his Excellency, with regard to the signature of the *procès-verbal* for the completion of the delimitation.

Lord Lansdowne proposes, with Mr. Brodrick's concurrence, to authorize Sir N. O'Connor to instruct Mr. Fitzmaurice to sign the *procès-verbal* as suggested.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 61.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 22.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 21st instant, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 22, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 61.

Mr. Fitzmaurice to Sir N. O'Connor.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 21, 1905.

ADEN delimitation.

Turkish Commissioner has received a further telegram, dated the 19th instant, from Minister of War regarding the line of boundary south-west. This second telegram is satisfactory, so far as lien on territory is concerned. Specific recognition as British of the Aulaki, and of three out of the four places, will also be secured if Grand Vizier can be induced, which Turkish Commissioner thinks can be effected without any great pressure, to authorize him to effect a settlement of north-eastern basis on the lines explained in my telegram No. 7, paragraph 3.

(Repeated to Viceroy, Foreign Department, and Secretary of State.)

* No. 51.

† No. 55.

42

No. 62.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 29.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, March 22, 1905.

HIS MAJESTY'S Government approve your telegram to Mr. Fitzmaurice, transmitted in your telegram No. 55 of the 20th instant.

The India Office will send instructions as to providing an escort. Meanwhile you may instruct Mr. Fitzmaurice to sign the *procès-verbal*.

No. 63.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to M. Cambon.

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 22, 1905.

WITH reference to the communication made by M. Geoffray on the 15th instant, I have the honour to state that His Majesty's Government have pleasure in accepting the suggestion of the French Government that, in order to facilitate the course of the pleadings before the Tribunal at The Hague in the Muscat Arbitration, and for the convenience of Chief Justice Melville Fuller, the English and French languages should be used concurrently in the proceedings.

His Majesty's Government would propose that a joint communication to this effect should be made to the Tribunal, and I should be obliged if your Excellency would ascertain whether the French Government agree to this course.

I have, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 64.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 23.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 23rd February, relative to Koweit affairs.

India Office, March 22, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 64.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Bushire, January 14, 1905.

IN continuation of this office telegram, dated the 22nd September, and with reference to the communications from the Foreign Department detailed in the margin,* I have the honour to submit details of those cases of interference by Belgian customs officials with Koweit subjects or property, which are up to now unsettled or may be regarded as still being a source of irritation at Koweit.

2. I am as yet unable to report further regarding the incident which recently took place at Fao, in which the Agent for the care of Sheikh Mubarek's property there was involved, as His Britannic Majesty's Consul has not been able to conclude the further investigation and report which I am expecting from him. The Political Agent at Koweit has at the same time been away in camp in co-operation with Mr. J. G. Lorimer, so that he has not been available for obtaining further information.

3. I now append separate *présis* of the detailed facts of six cases,† numbered respectively (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), and (g). The first four of these have already been briefly dealt with in paragraph 2 of despatch dated the 8th December, from the Govern-

* Dated December 1 and 15, 1904, and January 9, 1905.

[† Query. Seven cases, see *infra*.]

43

ment of India to the Secretary of State for India, of which a copy was forwarded to me under Foreign Department indorsement.

I will briefly comment on the items in detail:—

(a.) This case was mentioned to Government incidentally in this Office letter of the 2nd July, 1904, and remains *in statu quo*, the Customs having refused to refund the fine imposed.

In reference to it Sheikh Mubarek addressed me a long complaint, in the course of which he wrote:—

"We cannot endure this treatment, and your sense of what is right will surely not permit that those who are under your protection shall suffer in this way. If you afford us relief your will do us honour, and for such actions your great Government is noted. If you neglect to do so, and if this tyranny is not put a stop to, then we must seek some other state of things which will relieve us of it. At present all my subjects who travel for trade are in a state of terror."

I had to inform the Sheikh on the 6th July that the Customs had refused to comply with my representations, and that I was still not unmindful of the matter, but had had to report it to the Government of India for orders.

(b.) This case was only just alluded to in paragraph 3 of my letter before mentioned, and was reported to be "still under correspondence." Its further developments have been most unsatisfactory, and have resulted in much hardship to the *nakhoda* of the dhow in question, who appears to deserve substantial compensation, both for the loss of his goods and for the harassing protraction of his case over a period of six months.

(c.) Requires no special comment here, as the Government of India have already expressed their opinion on it, and there has since been no further development.

(d.) The same remarks apply to this case also, which is at present under reference to the Persian Government.

(e.) This is the case of the pilot Khalid. I last addressed the Government of India on the subject in this Office letter dated the 13th August.

The Persian Government having been silent on the matter for some five months, I thought that on receiving their Karguzar's report they had wisely decided to let the matter die a natural death. Such probably was the case. But realizing, perhaps, from Reuter's telegram of the 13th November, regarding the withdrawal of our Agent at Koweit, that we were not prepared to take up a strong position in regard to Sheikh Mubarek, they have, within the last few days, begun to interest themselves again in the case. I hope, however, that I may be able to settle it locally with the Karguzar without the necessity of troubling higher authority with it again.

(f.) This is the case to which the Government of India have alluded at the end of paragraph 6 of their despatch above mentioned, and have decided not to press it. I am not sure, however, whether, when they arrived at this decision, this Office letter, dated the 20th November, had been considered.

It is common report at Mohammerah and Bussorah, that these twenty-eight rifles were intended for the Nakib of Bussorah, but I quite understand the difficulty of pressing a case in which the arms, even if not bound for Persia, were evidently being smuggled. It will be noted, however, from the *présis* of the case appended, and from Captain Trevor's observations at the end of paragraph 3 of his letter, that there were also innocent goods on board belonging to Bahrein and Koweit subjects, who had shipped them in the ordinary way, and that these have been included in the confiscation.

The case of these unoffending persons seems to deserve independent consideration, and the principle governing the seizure of their merchandize has been referred to His Majesty's Ministry at Tehran, whose decision is awaited.

Foreign Department telegram, dated the 15th December, 1904, regarding the boundaries of jurisdiction on the Shatt-el-Arab, refers to this case. I still await information on this point from His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Bussorah, who, I think, has been away from head-quarters. I have sent him a reminder on the subject.

Mr. McDonall writes, from a Mohammerah point of view, that there appears to be nothing definitely laid down, but that in practice Sheikh Khazzal accepts the view that the deep channel used by the largest steamers represents the dividing line of jurisdiction.

I will report separately on this question as soon as all available material is to hand.

(g.) Alleged confiscation of some merchandize belonging to a Koweit subject from a Persian dhow.

This case has not hitherto been reported to Government, and at present sufficiently strong evidence has not been obtained to make it any use approaching the customs in the matter, or to ask the Government of India to take any action in regard thereto.

4. Apart from the cases of Koweit subjects with the Persian Customs, and reverting to the original inquiry made in the telegram from Foreign with Viceroy, dated the 1st December, I am led to believe that Sheikh Mubarek is, generally speaking, a good deal aggrieved by alleged oppression of Koweit dhows in matters of quarantine at Bussorah, but until I receive details from the Political Agent at Koweit on his return from camp I am not in a position to submit a satisfactory report in this connection, and beg leave to postpone it. I believe that this grievance is not a very pressing one at the present time.

CASE (a).

Seizure of a Koweit dhow, owned by Yusuf and Abdulla-bin-Abdul Kader, by the Steam-ship "Muzaffer," March 1904.

In March 1904 the Residency Agent, Lingah, reported that the Persian Customs revenue steamer "Muzaffer" had brought in tow a boat under Turkish colours which she had overtaken opposite Chiroo; that the boat belonged to the Koweit subjects above mentioned, and was commanded by nakhoda Rashid-bin-Freh; that she had shipped "chandals" (rafters) at Kuran (on the Island of Kishm) for Koweit; that as the nakhoda could not produce a Customs pass for the chandals the Director of Customs, who was on board the "Muzaffer," wished to search the boat for contraband; that finding it inconvenient to carry out a search in the open sea, the Director had ordered the vessel to be taken in tow in spite of the protests of the nakhoda, who had nothing contraband on board; that on arrival at Lingah the boat was searched, and, in spite of the fact that no contraband articles were found on board, the nakhoda was fined 100 tomans, ostensibly for not possessing the Customs papers for his cargo; the nakhoda stated that the papers were with the owner of the cargo at Kishm, and wrote to him for the same. He then applied to the Turkish Consular Agent for assistance, and the latter approached the Director-General, but without success, so that in order to avoid unlimited detention the nakhoda paid 100 tomans and eventually got his boat released. The papers were ultimately produced, and the fine was reduced to 25 tomans.

The Chief of Koweit, who had meanwhile been petitioned by the nakhoda, addressed the Resident on the 31st March, 1904, strongly protesting against the action of the Belgian Customs Administration.

The Director-General was then addressed on the subject, and in reply declared that the vessel was seized between the Island of Keis and the mainland, and that she was fined 25 tomans, as the nakhoda did not possess the necessary Customs documents.

As it was not known whether the vessel was seized within the 3-mile limit or not, inquiries were made both from Sheikh Mubarek and the Director-General. The former insisted that the boat was seized at sea out of sight of land, whereas the latter stated that it was overtaken in latitude 20° 40' 30" north, longitude 54° 7' east, between the Island of Keis and the mainland. The Director-General refused to refund the fine.

The Resident had then to inform the Sheikh of Koweit that the Director of Customs had refused to yield in any way to our representations, and that the case was therefore being represented to the Government of India. Mention of it was included in the Resident's letter No. 203, dated the 2nd July, 1904, to the address of the Foreign Secretary.

CASE (b).

Detention of Koweit dhow of Nakhoda Mubarak-bin-Khalifa at Shivoh.

Seizure of twenty bags of wheat and the jolly boat of the vessel, which has since been destroyed while in hands of Customs, May and June, 1904.

This dhow, which is the property of a Koweit subject named Yusuf-bin-Munis, left Koweit with a cargo of dates and wheat on or about the 14th May, 1904.

On arrival at Shivoh (near Lingah), the first port at which we called, the Customs Mudir there demanded of the nakhoda a Customs pass for his cargo. The nakhoda explained that as he came from Koweit he possessed no such paper, but that he held a certificate from Sheikh Mubarek to the effect that both dhow and cargo were from Koweit. The Mudir refused to accept this, and declared that the wheat was doubtless fraudulently shipped from some Persian port, and accordingly seized twenty bags of it. After detaining the boat for about five days the Mudir gave the nakhoda a letter on the Customs Director at Lingah; the nakhoda carried this to the addressee, who took the same view as his subordinate at Shivoh, and added that the vessel must await the decision of the Customs Inspector, who was expected to arrive shortly; or, if the nakhoda did not choose to wait, must land all his cargo. After a couple of days the Inspector arrived, and declined to acknowledge the authenticity of the Sheikh's letter, told the nakhoda that he would refer the matter to Bushire, and that pending orders from there he and his vessel would be detained.

The nakhoda, finding that, although he had been detained about three weeks he had failed to get any definite reply, and being unable to afford to waste any more time lest he should lose his chance of selling his dates, left the twenty bags at the custom-house, and sailed for the Arab coast to dispose of the rest of his cargo, which he found was rotting. At the same time he sent a Petition, representing the matter to Sheikh Mubarek. The latter, on receiving the nakhoda's complaint, wrote to this Residency under date the 22nd June, protesting against the action of the Customs authorities, and inclosing a Customs jowaz obtained from the Persian port of Mashoor, whence the wheat had been originally imported into Koweit.

The Director-General of Customs was addressed on the subject by this Residency, and was asked to state on what grounds the wheat had been confiscated, and whether he could see his way to release it. In reply, the Director-General stated that he was writing to Lingah for particulars. He subsequently wrote on the 16th July that as the nakhoda had declared that the wheat had been shipped at a Persian port, but had failed to produce the necessary Customs pass, twenty bags of wheat had been taken charge of as a security pending production of the necessary papers; that before the matter had been definitely settled the nakhoda had left in his dhow without giving any notice, and that therefore he had directed the sub-officer to seize the nakhoda on his arrival. He concluded by inquiring whether he was bound to furnish any explanation to the Residency on behalf of Koweit subjects. He was informed that as the nakhoda was a Koweit subject, the Resident considered he was entitled to give the man his Consular good offices.

About the same time the Government of India were addressed with a view to ascertaining how far British protection was to be extended to Koweit subjects, and it was suggested that the Chief of Koweit might be advised to use a distinctive flag for Koweit boats.

Meanwhile, on the 5th July the Residency Agent at Lingah reported that the dhow in question had been seized with her nakhoda at Mokam by the Customs authorities. The nakhoda was subsequently released through the intervention of the Zabit of Mokam and left in his boom for Koweit, but his jolly-boat was detained.

After a good deal of correspondence, M. Waffelaert ultimately wrote that in view of a promise he had made to the Resident, he was "prepared to be completely lenient towards the above nakhoda, and, as an exceptional case, release the twenty bags of wheat in question," and that they were at the disposal of the owner. He appeared to be under an impression that the nakhoda's jolly-boat had been restored to him. This, however, on reference to Lingah proved to be incorrect, and the jolly-boat was found to have been wrecked while under detention of the Customs at Mokam.

This case had now dragged on till the end of November, and on the 3rd December the question of compensation for the loss of the jolly-boat was broached to the

Director-General, but he replied on the 7th December refusing to entertain it, and declined to correspond further with the Residency in regard to Koweit subjects.

The bags of wheat have not yet been taken over by the owner, and are no doubt spoilt long ere this, so that the owner has lost both his jolly-boat and his twenty bags of wheat. Probable value in all about 300 rupees.

CASE (c).

Detention and Search of a dhow belonging to Sheikh Mubarek of Koweit, named the "Muselim," September 1904.

Sheikh Mubarek having heard that his boat named "Muselim," which habitually plies between Koweit and Fao on his own business, had been stopped, detained, and searched by a boat from the Persian Customs steamer "Muzaffer," about the middle of September 1904, wrote to the Political Agent, Koweit, strongly protesting against the action of the "Muzaffer." The Political Agent, in forwarding the Sheikh's complaint, stated that the feeling in Koweit itself was very bitter against the Belgian officials of the Persian Customs, owing to this incident and the seizure of Koweit boats in the Shatt-el-Arab, and might lead to retaliation. He also stated that the men from the "Muzaffer" were in the habit of firing ball cartridges at random when stopping a boat, and had done so in this case.

The case was represented to the Director-General of Customs, Bushire, who, after some letters had been exchanged with this Office, replied, under date the 3rd November, 1904, that the "Muzaffer" "has detained many 'booms and bellums,' but has never kept them longer than it was necessary for searching the inside of the craft." He added that "the Commander of our boat does not recollect anything particular about the boom 'Muselim,' but the mere fact of the crew shouting out that the vessel belonged to Sheikh Mubarek was not sufficient to prove that the boat did not carry contraband goods."

No satisfaction was obtained, and the matter was, therefore, reported to the Government of India in this Office letter of the 20th November, 1904.

CASE (d).

Detention of the Koweit dhow "Teyssir" by the Steam-ship "Muzaffer" in the Shatt-el-Arab. Seizure of arms found in her and imposition of fine on her Nakhoda, September 1904.

News reached Bushire from Mohammerah in the middle of September 1904, that the Persian Customs steamer "Muzaffer" had been searching all sailing vessels going up the Shatt-el-Arab for arms, without reference to the Chief of Mohammerah in whose jurisdiction the operations were conducted. The Chief was greatly exercised at these proceedings, and sent a complaint to the Persian Minister of the Interior.

On the 23rd September His Britannic Majesty's Consul, Mohammerah, reported that His Britannic Majesty's Consul, Bussorah, had sent to him the owner of a Koweit boat named "Teyssir," nakhoda Ali-bin-Muhammed Mubarak, which had been seized by the "Muzaffer" for having 12 rifles and 1,200 cartridges on board.

The owner stated that the vessel was bound for Sibilyat, near Bussorah, to load dates, and the arms and ammunition had been taken on board at Koweit for protection against pirates in the Shatt-el-Arab and the villages between Ras-el-Had and Fartag; that the arms had not been concealed; that the vessel had no intention of communicating with Persian territory; that while she was tacking up the river off the Turkish fort at Fao, she met boats from the "Muzaffer" and was seized.

On His Britannic Majesty's Consul, Mohammerah, representing the case to the Director-General of Customs, he stated that the rifles were concealed and new, with full complement of cartridges, and that as the importation of arms was prohibited in Turkey as well as Persia, it was immaterial whither they were bound.

He suggested that, as it would take some time to settle the case and a reference would have to be made to Tehran, the owner may pay a fine of double the value of the rifles under protest and get his vessel released. The owner, under the advice of the Consul, adopted the suggested course and paid 8,000 krans.

Sheikh Mubarak, on hearing of the proceedings of the "Muzaffer," made a complaint to the Resident through the Political Agent, Koweit, and the matter is before the Government of India, who are in communication with His Majesty's Legation, Tehran. The Wali of Bussorah has protested to the Persian Government against Persian gun-boats stopping and searching vessels in the Shatt-el-Arab proceeding to Bussorah.

The Government of India decided (*vide* telegram dated the 28th November, 1904) to represent the case to the Persian Government on the grounds that the arms were evidently for the defence of the dhow.

Still pending.

CASE (f).

Seizure of a Koweit dhow, Nakhoda Ghanum, by the Steam-ship "Muzaffer" in the Shatt-el-Arab, for having twenty-eight rifles on board. Subsequent confiscation of dhow and imprisonment of Nakhoda and confiscation of innocent goods, September 1904.

About the middle of September 1904 the Persian Customs steamer "Muzaffer," while searching sailing vessels for arms near the mouth of the Shatt-el-Arab, came across a Koweit boat commanded by nakhoda Ghanum, and seized it for having twenty-eight rifles concealed on board.

She was brought up to Mohammerah, where the Director of Customs offered to release her on receiving a fine of 18,000 krans, which he said could be paid under protest. As the fine demanded was more than the value of the boat, which was, moreover, mortgaged, the owner could not accept the terms.

The Director-General of Customs, Arabistan, then wired to the Director-General of Customs, Bushire, who went up to Mohammerah in the Persian gun-boat "Persepolis" and brought the Koweit boat in tow to Bushire, the "Muzaffer" following.

At Bushire nakhoda Ghanum was at first placed under ordinary detention, but later on consigned to a room in the Government House set apart for prisoners. He was then approached by a Customs representative with a suggestion that, if he signed a paper making over his boat to the Customs, he would be released. Before complying with the suggestion, he communicated with the Residency through his head priest and was advised not to do so pending receipt of a reply to a reference which was being made to the Government of India (*vide* Captain Trevor's telegram dated the 11th November, 1904).

Meanwhile, on the 12th November, orders were received by the local Customs authorities to definitely confiscate the boat, together with all her cargo, and confine the nakhoda pending payment of the fine.

The dhow was put up to auction on the 26th November, but no buyer came forward, and she still remains unsold. The nakhoda was released, as nothing more could be got out of him, and returned to Koweit on the 7th December.

Four bundles canvas and some skins belonging to Bahrein and Koweit subjects, which were shipped quite innocently in this boat for Bussorah, were confiscated and sold for the benefit of the Persian Government, the endeavours of this Residency to get the Director-General of Customs to release them proving unavailing. The case was reported to the Government of India in this Office letter dated the 20th November, 1904.

CASE (g).

Alleged confiscation of goods belonging to a Koweit subject, Yusuf-el-Haris, found in Persian dhow, August 1904.

In August 1904 the Chief of Koweit sent to the Resident a complaint from Yusuf-el-Haris, one of his subjects, to the effect that the Persian Customs revenue steamer "Muzaffer" overtook a Persian sailing vessel off Maghoo (near Lingah) which had among her cargo twenty cases vermicelli, and one case containing seventeen compasses and six yards broad-cloth on board for him; examined the vessel's cargo; demanded a Customs pass, which not being forthcoming, one case vermicelli and the case of compasses and broad-cloth were removed from her. Yusuf stated that the goods were consigned to him from Karachi in a Bahrein boat, and were to be

transhipped at Bahrein for Koweit, but that on the nakhoda of the Bahrein boat finding near Basidu a Persian boat bound for Koweit, they were transhipped to her at sea. It was after this transshipment that the "Muzaffer" met the boat bound for Koweit. The nakhoda of this dhow is a resident of Koweit, but a Persian subject, as also were the crew.

On the matter being represented by the Residency to the Director-General of Customs, Bushire, he replied as follows:—

"On the 1st July last, on our way to Cherek, we came across a big boat flying the Persian flag. Having stopped the boat we learned that it belonged to Haji Mahomed Dilomy. From the statements which Khalifa-bin-Abdulla, the nephew of the said Haji Mahomed, made in reply to my* questions, it resulted that the boat came from Kharmir, a Persian port, near Bunder Abbas, where she had been to sell her cargo of wheat and barley. The nakhoda declared now to have on board twenty cases vermicelli and thirteen bags dried beans shipped at Khamir for Dilom. In searching the boat we found the statement regarding the quantity of the goods correct. To my demand to produce the Customs "cabotage jowaz," the nakhoda replied that the documents were sent to Dilom by post. This kind of proceeding appearing to me very strange, I demanded that two cases vermicelli and one bag beans should be deposited as a guarantee with us, and to be released on presentation of the necessary documents. As to the box of seventeen compasses and six yards broad-cloth, we did not see any of them on board the said boat."

The above answer was communicated to the Political Agent, Koweit, who informed Sheikh Mubarek of it. Sheikh Mubarek thereupon sent the nakhoda of the vessel and Yusuf-el-Haris to the Political Agent, who took down their statements. The nakhoda declared that the "Muzaffer" confiscated the boxes containing vermicelli, broad-cloth, and compasses, but his unsupported statement alone will not be accepted by the Customs, and although endeavours have since been made to obtain corroboration from the crew of the vessel and from the nakhoda of the Bahrein vessel from which the goods were transhipped, so far we have been unable to find them, and Yusuf-el-Haris was not himself present when the goods were transhipped.

No. 65.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 23.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 23rd February, relative to the refusal of Consul Grey at Muscat to authorize the British India Steam Navigation Company, at the request of M. Goguyer, to embark arms and ammunition for Koweit.

India Office, March 22, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 65.

Major Grey to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Muscat, February 6, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward, for your information, copies of a letter which I received from M. Goguyer, and of my reply to him.

2. The correspondence is interesting in connection with the inclosure to my letter dated 22nd, 1904, to your address.

3. A copy of this letter will be forwarded to the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, Bushire.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. G. GREY.

* Moses Khan, Armenian assistant.

Inclosure 2 in No. 65.

M. Goguyer to Major Grey.

M. le Consul,

Mascat, le 5 Février, 1905.

J'AI l'honneur de vous prier de vouloir bien autoriser l'agence de la British India Steam-ship Company à embarquer pour moi, sur le vapeur le plus prochain à destination de Koweit, une caisse contenant un fusil double avec 500 cartouches, à destination du Seyyid Khelef, fils du défunt Naquib de Bassorah, actuellement à la résidence de Koweit.

Espérant que vous accueillerez ma demande avec votre bienveillance habituelle et vous en remerciant, je vous prie, &c.

(Signé) A. GOGUYER.

Inclosure 3 in No. 65.

Major Grey to M. Goguyer.

Monsieur,

Mascat, le 5 Février, 1905.

J'AI l'honneur de vous accuser réception de votre lettre, mais puisque l'importation des fusils et des cartouches à Koweit est défendue, je regrette infiniment de ne pouvoir pas autoriser l'agence de la British India Steam Navigation Company d'en embarquer pour Koweit sans permission de mon Gouvernement.

Agréé, &c.

(Signé) W. G. GREY,
Consul de la Grande-Bretagne à Mascat.

No. 66.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 23.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 22nd March, relative to the Political Agent at Koweit.

India Office, March 22, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 66.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 22, 1905.

KOWEIT Political Agent. We propose that when, in May next, Lorimer proceeds on leave, Knox should be posted temporarily to officiate at Ahwaz. Also, with a view to allaying resentment and suspicion felt by Mubarak at withdrawal of our Agent, we would make arrangements for Knox to visit Koweit from Ahwaz in the event of Lorimer being away for more than three months. See reference to paragraph 7 of the letter from Government of India of the 19th January, 1905, Secret.

(Repeated to Resident in Persian Gulf.)

No. 67.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 23, 1905.

I HAVE laid before the Marquess of Lansdowne your letters of 14th and 17th February relative to the proposed reorganization of the Muscat Customs.

It is in Lord Lansdowne's opinion undesirable that His Majesty's Government should at the present moment initiate any considerable change in the internal administration of Muscat which would afford to the French Government grounds of complaint or a pretext for a counter-move on their side, and it appears to his Lordship that an arrangement might be made of a less far-reaching character than that proposed by the Government of India which would yet insure the efficient reorganization of the Sultan's Customs while it could not reasonably be held to affect His Highness' independent status.

There could clearly be no objection to the Sultan appointing as head Customs officer an official recommended to him by the Government of India at his request.

The stipulation that the British Political Agent is to decide in all "important" cases between the Sultan and the Customs officer seems to be of a more questionable character. It might be argued with considerable force that such a stipulation does affect the Sultan's independence, and opportunity might be given for endless discussion as to the "importance" of each case as it arose.

The proposed guarantee of the Customs revenue might equally be considered as equivalent to a subsidy and consequently incompatible with the Sultan's complete independence.

The provision that the arrangement shall be terminable at one year's notice is also open to grave objection as exposing the parties to a perpetual reopening of the controversy.

Lord Lansdowne requests that you will lay these observations before Mr. Brodrick for his consideration, and he would further suggest that any action which it may eventually be decided to take in the matter might with advantage be deferred until the conclusion of the arbitration before The Hague Tribunal.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 68.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 24.)

Sir,

India Office, March 22, 1905.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 21st instant, forwarding a telegram from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople as to the Aden delimitation, and to state, in reply, that Mr. Secretary Brodrick concurs in the proposal of the Marquess of Lansdowne to authorize Sir N. O'Connor to instruct Mr. Fitzmaurice to sign the *procès-verbal* relating to the demarcation of the line from Mudariba to Sheikh Murad on the coast.

I am, &c.

(Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 69.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 24.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 22nd instant, relative to Muscat affairs.

India Office, March 23, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 69.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, March 22, 1905.

MUSCAT. Exception is taken by Foreign Office to Grey's action, as reported in his letter of the 14th January last, in moving the Sultan to refuse French Vice-Consul facilities for his journey to Sur, which, it is presumed, would be accorded as a matter of course to the British Consul. Our relations with Muscat do not, in the opinion of the Foreign Office, justify such interference, and they are not prepared to defend it in the event of protest being made by French Government. Grey should be careful about intervening between the French Consul and the Sultan in questions of this kind in the absence of specific orders, and I request that he may be instructed accordingly.

No. 70.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 25.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 24th March, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 24, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 70.

*Mr. Fitzmaurice to Sir N. O'Connor.**March 24, 1905.*

(Telegraphic.) P.

ADEN delimitation.

Authorization referred to in your Excellency's telegram No. 8 has not yet been received by Turkish Commissioner. He therefore telegraphed direct to the Turkish Minister of War, on the 22nd instant, requesting that he might be given authority by his Government to recognize as British the districts mentioned in my telegram No. 7, paragraph 3, while maintaining generally that the boundary north-east is a straight line to the desert, subject to such deviations as may be found necessary by a future Commission on visiting the localities. Commissioner expects shortly to receive a reply to the above.

Please refer to my telegram No. 29 of 1903 with regard to the Aulaki.

(Repeated to Foreign Secretary, Government of India, and Secretary of State.)

No. 71.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 25.)

(No. 58.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 25, 1905.

TO-DAY I sent the following telegram, No. 11, to Mr. Fitzmaurice:—

"With reference to your yesterday's telegram No. 9.

"In the list of nine cantons communicated in 1873 to Porte, and also in that presented in consequence of your telegram No. 29 of 1903 on the 7th September of that year, Aulaki was included.

"Moreover, Iradé of February 1903 leaves no doubt on the subject."

No. 72.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 95.)

Foreign Office, March 25, 1905.

Sir,

I HAVE received your Excellency's despatch No. 168 of the 14th instant, forwarding copy of the instructions sent by the Sublime Porte to the Yemen authorities for the completion of the Aden delimitation.

His Majesty's Government have learnt with satisfaction the result of your Excellency's representations, and your action in the matter is entirely approved.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 73.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 27.)

(No. 178.)

Constantinople, March 21, 1905.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 170, of the 14th instant, inclosing a despatch from Colonel Maunsell on the subject of the insurrection in the Yemen, I have the honour to report that a rumour was current here yesterday that Sanaa, the capital of the district, had been taken by the insurgents. This report has not been confirmed, and its truth is denied by the Grand Vizier; but there can be no doubt that the state of affairs in the province is very serious, and is a source of much anxiety to the Porte. According to news received from Hodeida, the troops under Brigadier Riza Pasha who were besieged at Maaber have succeeded in breaking out, with a loss of seventeen killed and fifty-eight wounded, after four days' continuous fighting, and have effected a junction with the Commander-in-Chief, Ali Riza Pasha, who is moving on Taiz with his whole force. This move has perhaps been prompted by information received from the Mutessarif of Taiz, who has reported that the rebels were about to besiege Kataba, pointing out, at the same time, that the disturbances in the neighbourhood of the frontier might furnish the English with a pretext for invasion.

The Turkish Government is endeavouring to meet the situation by the continued dispatch of reinforcements. Twenty-four battalions of troops, forming the first levy, have embarked at Akaba, and the greater part, if not the whole, must already have reached Hodeida. It is reported from Damascus that six battalions of Nizams passed through that place en route for Akaba some little time ago, but it is not quite clear whether these troops are in addition to the twenty-four battalions already mentioned. Considerable difficulty has occurred with regard to transport both by land and sea. The troops reach Akaba very slowly, and, as it has been found impossible to charter foreign vessels, the authorities have been obliged to employ the ships of the Mahssousé Company.

In the meanwhile, with a view to obviate the difficulties of land transport on future occasions, orders have been issued for the survey of the route from Maan to Akaba for the construction of a railway.

It appears that, in response to the representations of Ali Riza Pasha, the Sultan has approved the following additional measures:—

Eight Nizam battalions to be withdrawn from Janina and shipped from Prevesa, their places being taken by the Redifs of Naslitch (Serfidia Sandjak), which will at once be called under arms; the Vilayets of Aleppo, Syria, and Beyrout to prepare transport animals at the rate of forty mules for each battalion; a special steamer to be chartered at Constantinople to convey 6,600 Mausers for these troops, and 27,000 Mausers and four maxims for the thirty-seven battalions actually in the Yemen.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 74.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 27.)

(No. 179.)

Constantinople, March 21, 1905.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 170 of the 14th instant, I have the honour to report that, according to information which has just reached me, the Turkish Government no longer intends to rely solely on military measures for the re-establishment of order in the Yemen. It has now been proposed to place a considerable sum of money at the disposal of the Commander-in-chief for the purpose of buying over the principal Sheikhs, while at the same time it is said that the Council of Ministers have been ordered to inquire and report upon various abuses in the collection of the taxes and other complaints which have recently reached His Majesty's ears.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 75.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 27.)

(No. 187.)

Constantinople, March 21, 1905.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship paraphrases of telegram^s which I have had occasion recently to send to Mr. Fitzmaurice, C.M.G., on the subject of the negotiations for the delimitation of the Aden frontier.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure 1 in No. 75.

Sir N. O'Connor to Mr. Fitzmaurice.

(No. 1.)

Constantinople, March 3, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

I APPROVE suggestion made in your telegram No. 2, but Commission should urge acceptance of Memorandum of the 11th August, 1904, and I advise you to press them to do so.

I have informed the Foreign Office of this.

Inclosure 2 in No. 75.

Sir N. O'Connor to Mr. Fitzmaurice.

(No. 2.)

Constantinople, March 12, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

I WILL communicate to you the arrangement made with the Porte yesterday for delimitation of southern frontier, &c., on receiving approval of His Majesty's Government.

The telegram which the Turkish Commissioner was persuaded by you to send will, I am confident, prevent any backsliding in this respect.

Inclosure 3 in No. 75.

Sir N. O'Connor to Mr. Fitzmaurice.

(No. 5.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 14, 1905.

THE instructions sent for the delimitation of southern and north-eastern frontier to Yemen authorities have been communicated to me in a *note verbale* by Porte.

It is unnecessary to detain "Perseus," as these instructions are satisfactory.

Orders to proceed immediately with southern frontier from Mudariba to Sheikh Mirad are contained in these instructions.

Inclosure 4 in No. 75.

Sir N. O'Connor to Mr. Fitzmaurice.

(No. 6.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 16, 1905.

MAIL of 21st instant will bring you copy of instructions given to Turkish Commissioners on 13th instant through Hodeida.

The determination of the Mudariba to Sheikh Mirad frontier should, as I need hardly say, be concluded without delay.

Inclosure 5 in No. 75.

Sir N. O'Connor to Mr. Fitzmaurice.

(No. 7.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 18, 1905.

FOLLOWING is sense of instructions telegraphed by the Grand Vizier to the Turkish Commissioners, and communicated to me in *note verbale* :—

Decision has been arrived at with British Embassy to effect that Subeih frontier shall be drawn down to Sheikh Mirad, leaving Turba and the wells on the Yemen side, it being stipulated that no cession shall be made by the Imperial Government to any third Power of the territory adjoining this line. The Boundary Commission are then to proceed, in accordance with the *Irade* of February 1903, with the delimitation of the Yaffai frontier.

It is stated in the instructions to the Minister of War, which are similar to those sent to the Grand Vizier, that Rubeaten and the three other places are considered by His Majesty's Government to be dependencies of the Yaffai tribe.

His Majesty's Government have approved this arrangement, but before sending you instructions as to signature, it is desirable that they should see the *note verbale* and its inclosures. They are due in London to-day.

Inform me whether Ottoman Commissioner has received instructions.

As regards the *procès-verbal*, I leave it to your discretion to decide what points should be recorded.

No. 76.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 27.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 15th March, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 27, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 76.

Mr. Brodrick to the Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, March 15, 1905.

ADEN delimitation.

His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople reports that a satisfactory arrangement has been made by him with Turkish Government in regard to southern frontier which is to terminate at Sheikh Mirad.

Sir N. O'Connor also reports that the Vali will be sent instructions to the effect that delimitation of Yaffai frontier is to be proceeded with in due course by the Boundary Commission. Rubeaten and other places, so far as they may be proved to be Yaffai, will be covered by this arrangement.

Sir N. O'Connor's action has been approved by His Majesty's Government.

No. 77.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 27.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 23rd March, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 27, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 77.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, March 23, 1905.

ADEN delimitation. My telegram of the 15th instant.

Instructions, substantially in conformity with our demands, for demarcation of the Subaihi frontier from Mudariba to Mirad, as well as of frontier of Yaffai to the north-east, have now been received by the Yemen authorities. I shall be glad if, as requested by His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, you will make the necessary arrangements to furnish Mr. Fitzmaurice with an escort, so as to enable him to complete the southern frontier at the earliest possible date.

(Repeated to Aden.)

No. 78.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 27.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 27th March, relative to the Muscat arbitration.

India Office, March 27, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 78.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 27, 1905.

MUSCAT arbitration. My telegram of the 14th instant.

We are sending by next mail map showing the boundary of Muscat, together with a note by Lorimer. Government of India still advocate keeping the case strictly

within the lines of the Agreement of the (13th ?) October, and strongly deprecate filing the map or defining the Sultan's territories. If, however, it is impossible to avoid discussion of the question, Lorimer's sketch is, in our opinion, suitable as a general approximation. Consequently, in view of information recently received and the altered circumstances presented by the now declared attitude of the French, we may, without detriment, modify the view which we have previously expressed as to the independence of the coast round Musandim Promontory, from Dibba as far as Tibba. See my Secret despatch of the 23rd October, 1902. Should the question of Gwadur be raised, it if not necessary to bring forward the claim of the Khan of Khelat.

No. 79.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 27.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram for Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 27th March, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 27, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 79.

Mr. Fitzmaurice to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 10.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 27, 1905.

ADEN delimitation. Instructions received by Turkish Commissioner on the 26th instant are that a clause respecting non-alienation of "the territory adjoining Sheikh Murad boundary line" is to be inserted in the *procès-verbal*. Expression "territory adjoining," &c., is vague and might apply to that lying to the south of the line. Turkish Commissioner has telegraphed to-day inquiring whether the territory referred to in his instructions is that which lies between the inner and outer lines. As regards the north-east he can only agree to boundary of which an outline was given in the British Commissioner's letter No. 333 of 1903, paragraph 4.

Please refer to your telegram No. 7, paragraph 4. Signature by me of *procès-verbal* in the above sense seems useless. Accordingly, as arrangement with the Porte is considered by Government to be satisfactory with regard to both points, I propose simply to sign the map showing the line of boundary to Sheikh Murad, unless I receive instructions to await the result of the above-mentioned telegram sent by the Turkish Commissioner and of the other telegram sent by him as reported in my No. 9.

(Repeated to Viceroy, Foreign Department, and Secretary of State for India.)

No. 80.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 28.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 27th instant, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, March 28, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 80.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 27, 1905.

ADEN delimitation. Government of Bombay have been requested to consult Resident at Aden and Mr. Fitzmaurice with regard to escort and to submit proposals. There appears to be a want of precision in the language of the *note verbale*, as

communicated in his telegram No. 7 of the 18th instant by His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople to Mr. Fitzmaurice. We trust that all territory up to the coast as far north as Kudam will be clearly included in the pledge not to alienate debatable territory surrendered by us which is to be given by the Turkish Government.
(Repeated to Political Department, Bombay.)

No. 81.

Sir H. Howard to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 29.)

(No. 49.)

My Lord,

The Hague, March 28, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 30 of the 27th ultimo, on the subject of the Muscat Arbitration, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a note from M. de Ruyssenaers, communicating the reply he has received to the letter in which he informed Mr. Justice Fuller of M. Savornin Lohman's opinion in regard to the delay fixed by the Anglo-French Agreement of the 13th October last for the selection of an Umpire by the two Arbitrators in that arbitration.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HENRY HOWARD.

Inclosure 1 in No. 81.

M. de Ruyssenaers to Sir H. Howard.

M. le Ministre,

La Haye, le 27 Mars, 1905.

POUR faire suite à ma communication du 27 Février dernier, j'ai l'honneur de faire parvenir ci-joint à votre Excellence copie d'une lettre, datée du 13 courant, que je viens de recevoir de Mr. Melville W. Fuller, en réponse à une lettre, datée du 27 Février dernier, par laquelle je lui ai fait connaître l'opinion de M. de Savornin Lohman au sujet du délai dans lequel les deux Arbitres, désignés par la Grande-Bretagne et la France, devaient procéder au choix du Sur-Arbitre.

Veillez, &c.

(Signé) L. H. RUYSSENAERS.

Inclosure 2 in No. 81.

Mr. Justice Fuller to M. de Ruyssenaers.

Supreme Court of the United States,

Chief Justice's Chambers, March 13, 1905.

Dear Mr. Secretary-General,

I BEG to acknowledge the receipt of your two letters of the 27th February, the one inclosing copy of the letter of his Excellency, Count Nigra, dated the 23rd February, and the other copies of Dr. Lohman's communication of the 26th February, and of yours to the Ministers of France and Great Britain.

I accepted with reluctance the view of my colleague that, in the circumstances, the thirty days given for selecting the Umpire was an imperative limitation and expired the 25th February, but did not care to discuss the matter by cable.

Pray tender my regrets to Dr. Lohman, and accept, &c.

(Signed) MELVILLE W. FULLER.

No. 82.

*M. Cambon to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 30.)**Ambassade de France, Londres,
le 27 Mars, 1905.*

M. le Marquis,

MON Gouvernement, auquel j'avais eu soin de donner connaissance de la note de votre Seigneurie en date du 13 de ce mois, me charge de faire savoir à votre Seigneurie qu'il ne peut que prendre acte de la promesse qui y est faite d'omettre à l'avenir le nom du Sultan de Mascate des documents qui seront ultérieurement présentés au Tribunal Arbitral pour l'affaire des boutres.

Mais il me charge en même temps de formuler toutes réserves sur les arguments invoqués dans la note en question pour justifier, en raison d'un droit "moral," l'introduction aux débats de la personne du Sultan.

Au cours d'un des entretiens que j'ai eu avec votre Seigneurie, le 25 Mai, 1903—le jour même de l'accord intervenu entre nos deux Gouvernements—j'avais eu soin de déclarer que nous admettions l'arbitrage sur l'interprétation de nos Conventions avec la Grande-Bretagne ou des Déclarations communes aux deux pays, mais que nous n'entendions en aucune façon accepter les demandes d'arbitrage qu'il plairait au Sultan de Mascate de nous adresser.

Ces déclarations amenèrent le retrait par votre Seigneurie d'un projet de note qu'elle m'avait soumis et qui envisageait précisément l'intervention éventuelle aux débats du Sultan de Mascate.

Veuillez, &c.
(Signé) PAUL CAMBON.

No. 83.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 30.)

Sir,

India Office, March 29, 1905.

WITH reference to Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 18th March, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to invite the attention of the Marquess of Lansdowne to the telegram from the Viceroy of the 22nd March as to the arrangements to be made for the temporary withdrawal of the Political Agent at Koweit.

Subject to Lord Lansdowne's concurrence, Mr. Brodrick proposes to approve the Viceroy's recommendation that Major Knox should be posted temporarily to the Vice-Consulship at Ahwaz when Mr. Lorimer leaves that place on furlough in May next, and that Major Knox should return to Koweit on a visit after three months if Mr. Lorimer is absent from his post for more than that period. The question of the duration of Major Knox' stay at Koweit after his return there might be considered when the time arrives for his visit to take place.

Meanwhile, I am to suggest that, should Lord Lansdowne see no objection, the necessary steps may be taken to enable Major Stuart George Knox to act as His Britannic Majesty's Vice-Consul at Ahwaz, vice Mr. Lorimer, when the latter proceeds on leave.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 84.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 30.)

Sir,

India Office, March 29, 1905.

WITH reference to the telegram from the Viceroy of the 27th instant on the subject of the Aden delimitation, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to suggest, for the consideration of the Marquess of Lansdowne, that the attention of His

Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople should be drawn to the importance of avoiding any ambiguity in the undertaking of the Turkish Government as to the non-alienation of that portion of Subaihi territory which we are surrendering, to the north of the line which has been accepted as that of the demarcation.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 85.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 30.)

Sir,

India Office, March 29, 1905.

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to acknowledge receipt of your letters of the 17th and 21st instant, relative to the complaint made by the Turkish Ambassador as to a building which is said to have been erected by the orders of the British naval authorities on the mainland opposite Bahrein.

In reply, I am to state that a despatch is being sent to the Government of India asking for a report on the facts. Mr. Brodrick does not think it necessary to make inquiry by telegraph, in view of the numerous occasions on which, as pointed out in Lord Lansdowne's despatch to Mr. Townley of the 1st March, specific statements by the local Turkish authorities have proved to be without foundation.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 86.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 31.)

(No. 189.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 27, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 178 of the 21st instant, I have the honour to report that Mr. Richardson, British Vice-Consul at Hodeidah, informs me that altogether 15,000 troops have landed at that place since January. Of these, 10,000 are now marching under Riza Pasha for the relief of Sanaa, which, although hard pressed, is still holding out. Two thousand more left on the 24th for Mokha en route for Taiz.

The insurgents have captured Hajje and several garrisoned towns in South-Eastern Yemen, and it is stated that they intend to move on Kataba.

According to advices from Jeddah, dated the 6th March, three steamers, viz., "Abdul Kader" (Turkish), "Alsace" (French), and "Tirreno" (Italian), are proceeding to Akaba to embark about 6,000 troops for Hodeidah.

I am also informed that six vessels, in addition to the one mentioned in a previous despatch, have been loading military stores at Constantinople for the Yemen, and that some, if not all of them, will proceed first to Prevesa to embark the eight Nizam battalions of the Janina division.

It is stated that the Turkish troops are greatly hampered by want of transport, and that Ali Riza Pasha, who is now ready to proceed to the relief of Sanaa, finds it impossible to take any supplies for the garrison. He has requested that he may be supplied with 500 or 600 transport animals, or that he may be authorized to take £T. 2,000, which are in Hodeidah Post-office, for the purpose of obtaining camels in the Yemen itself.

Since writing the above I have received a telegram from Jeddah reporting that it was expected there that Sanaa would be relieved in a few days, and that the rebels' hopes were diminishing. Hajje was captured on the 24th February with 800 Turkish troops and 12 guns, and Yarim, and Damar, and three other small places with about 400 men in all.

The total number of Turkish troops in the Yemen is estimated at 35,000, besides six battalions which are now arriving from Akaba, and eight from Constantinople.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONNOR.

No. 87.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received March 31.)

(No. 190.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 27, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 157 of the 8th instant, I have the honour to summarize as follows, information which has reached me from various sources respecting the Turkish military expedition to Nejd:—

It appears that Feizi Pasha, Commander of the expedition, finding the movements of his troops hampered by want of transport, was compelled to leave the bulk of his forces at Wakiah, a place situate 100 miles on the route to Kazim from Nejef. He himself advanced 170 miles further across waterless deserts to Lina, taking only two battalions of infantry, four field and two mountain guns, and 100 cavalry. From there he sent word to Ibn Reshid calling upon him to come in person or to send his confidential agent with 300 camels. Efforts are being made to provide the troops at Wakiah with transport, but as they can only rejoin their chief by a desert march of twelve days, it has been suggested that he should be reinforced from a point on the coast which is said to be only six days' distant.

It has been reported to me from Jeddah that Feizi Pasha, having with him only 8,000 troops and artillery, met Ibn Reshid on the 20th February, and that other troops had left Medina to join them, but I do not think that this information, which does not altogether tally with that received from other sources, can be accepted without reserve.

Whilst on this subject I may mention that I hear from Bussorah that Ibn Saoud's father received 58 liras a month from the Turkish Government for ten years till 1903, and that he now demands that payment should be continued from that year.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 88.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 31.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 28th instant, relative to the Muscat customs.

India Office, March 31, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 88.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 28, 1905.

MUSCAT Customs administration.

Your telegram of the 13th February last has been considered by His Majesty's Government. They see no ground for objection to the appointment by the Sultan of an official recommended by Government of India as Superintendent of Customs. With regard, however, to the proposed guarantee of customs, which might be considered equivalent to a subsidy, and to the proposal that important questions should be referred for decision to the British Political Agent, His Majesty's Government are of opinion that these measures might be held to be incompatible with the complete independence of the Sultan. Pending the conclusion of The Hague Arbitration, His Majesty's Government are of opinion that it is desirable to defer any action which it may be decided ultimately to take.

No. 89.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 31.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 30th March, relative to the French flag question at Muscat.

India Office, March 31, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 89.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

March 30, 1905.

MUSCAT arbitration. Political Agent at Muscat telegraphs, on the 26th instant, as follows:—

"French Consul at Muscat has addressed to the Sultan an official communication forwarding, 'by order of the French Government,' a 'list of dhow owners who are under French protection and whose names the French Government and the British Government have agreed should be given' to the Sultan. This communication, with the list inclosed, was delivered to the Sultan yesterday evening. His Highness declined to receive the list, and returned it to the Consul with an intimation that he does not admit the French Government's claim to protect the persons mentioned therein, and referring the French Government to His Majesty's Government as representing his Highness at the Hague Court. By next mail I am sending particulars to India, and also, in order to avoid delay, to the Foreign Office direct."

We have sent the following reply to the Political Agent at Muscat:—

"With reference to your telegram of the 26th instant, we have long been pressing the French Government to furnish list of dhow owners, and you may advise the Sultan, if he consults you on the subject, to receive the list without prejudice to the question of the right of the French Government to protect the persons named in it."

"We are repeating this telegram to Bombay."

We are sending by to-day's mail the last batch of papers which have to be sent from India for the British Counter-Case.

No. 90.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 32.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, March 31, 1905.

GREAT importance is attached by the India Office to avoiding any ambiguity in the undertaking of the Turkish Government that no portion of the Subaihi territory, which we are surrendering north of the Sheikh Mirad line shall be alienated.

Is all the territory up to the coast, as far north as Kudam, clearly included in this undertaking?

No. 91.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 1.)

(No. 60.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, April 1, 1905.

AFTER severe fighting, Sanaa was relieved on the 28th March, according to report received from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida.

62

No. 92.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 1.)

(No. 61.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, April 1, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's telegram No. 32 of yesterday on the subject of Aden.

I to-day got a written communication from the Porte, stating that the undertaking respecting non-alienation covers the 550 square miles referred to in my Memorandum of the 11th August last. This was already, in my opinion, quite clear, but the present communication removes all possible doubt.

No. 93.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 3.)

(No. 198.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 28, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 189 of the 27th instant respecting the state of affairs in the Yemen, I have the honour to report that the military authorities at Beyrout have received orders to collect from the districts of Acre and Haifa seven battalions of reserves with the least possible delay.

It is stated that these troops are destined for the Yemen, and that they will proceed via the Suez Canal owing to the difficulty of provisioning troops at Maan and on the three days' march to Akaba.

I should add that I learn here that of the troops recently sent to Akaba several battalions, numbering in all 5,183 men, have already been dispatched to Hodeidah by steamers of various nationalities.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 94.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 3.)

(No. 200. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 29, 1905.

WITH reference to my postal telegram No. 159 of the 13th instant, respecting the intrigues of the Vali of Bussorah with the Sheikh of Koweit, and the instructions which I was sending to His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah on this subject, I have the honour to report that having learnt from confidential sources that the question of Bahrein was also occupying the Vali, I sent a further telegram to Mr. Monahan to the effect that he should let the Vali clearly understand that His Majesty's Government regard Bahrein as being virtually under British protection.

Mr. Monahan has now reported that, in a conversation which he had with the Vali on the 23rd instant, the latter said to him that of course the general *status quo* in Koweit would be respected if such was the decision of the Government, but the relations between the Sheikh and the Vali must be changed. The Sheikh did not pay attention to any request, and the Vali could get back deserters and criminals from Persia, but not from Koweit. His Excellency admitted that such cases had not occurred lately, but he said the principle was important, and cases of that nature might occur.

Mr. Monahan then went on to say that natives of Bahrein had applied to him for protection against robbers. The Vali merely replied that the new Mutessarif was in Hasa, and that he would do what was necessary.

Mr. Monahan informs me, in reply to my inquiries, that there are eight Turkish soldiers with a sergeant on Bubian Island.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

63

No. 95.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 3.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 31st March, relative to the Musandim flag-staffs.

India Office, April 3, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 95.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, March 31, 1905.

FLAG-STAFFS on Musandim. Your telegram of the 22nd instant.

Matter has been considered by Defence Committee, and His Majesty's Government have decided to rely for the protection of our interests in the Persian Gulf upon the statement made by Lord Lansdowne on the 5th May, 1903, in the House of Lords, viz., that the establishment by a foreign Power of a naval base in the Gulf will be resisted by us with all the means in our power. Consequently, it will be sufficient for the flag-staff on Telegraph Island to be maintained as a sign of our continued occupation; but pending delivery of Muscat Arbitration Award by Hague Tribunal no action should be taken in regard to it. The two remaining flag-staffs should be abandoned. In these circumstances, further discussion with the Admiralty is unnecessary. A despatch on the subject will follow.

No. 96.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received April 4.)

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Admiralty, April 1, 1905.

I AM commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit herewith, for the information of the Marquess of Lansdowne, copy of a letter dated the 10th ultimo, with inclosures, from the Commander-in-chief on the East Indies station, relative to the state of affairs at Bahrein.

I am, &c.

(Signed) C. I. THOMAS.

Inclosure 1 in No. 96.

Rear-Admiral Atkinson-Willes to Admiralty.

(Confidential.)

March 10, 1905.

IN forwarding Captain Eustace's letter of proceedings, I have the honour to report that, in accordance with the Secretary of State's instructions to the Governor-General in Council, I placed "Fox," "Sphinx," and "Redbreast" under command of Captain Eustace of the "Fox," to carry out the wishes of the Political Resident, Major Cox, as defined in the instructions given to him by the Government of India, which were received from His Majesty's Government.

2. Captain Eustace appears to have so disposed his flotilla that the Sheikh Esa was overawed, and complied with the demands, although he appears to have allowed his nephew, Sheikh Ali, and Mullah Achmed, a turbulent priest, to escape.

3. I consider that Captain Eustace and the officers and men under him carried out a difficult task with forethought, firmness, and forbearance, and brought a troublesome difference with Sheikh Esa and the Mullah to a satisfactory, because peaceful, solution.

4. The Sheikh is a weak old Chief, and was much under the influence of Sheikh Ali and Mullah Achmed, both of whom fled from Bahrein into the country bordering Al Katr.

(Signed) GEORGE L. ATKINSON-WILLES,
Rear-Admiral, Commander-in-chief.

Inclosure 2 in No. 96.

Captain Eustace to Rear-Admiral Atkinson-Willes.

Sir,

"Fox," at Bahrein, March 2, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that in accordance with your telegraphic orders of the 19th February, 1905, I left Bushire on the 20th, and anchored off Bahrein on the 21st. His Majesty's ship "Sphinx" was found at anchor off Manamah. On the 22nd I weighed and anchored in the outer harbour. His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" arrived at 5 P.M. on the 23rd with Major P. Z. Cox, C.I.E., Political Resident to the Persian Gulf, who landed under a salute of thirteen guns from His Majesty's ship "Sphinx" at 7 P.M.

2. A salute of five guns was fired by the shore battery at Manamah, under the misapprehension that Sheikh had called upon the Resident; he, however, paid his first visit at 8 A.M. on the 24th, at the Residency, Manamah, when he was informed by Major Cox that he was wanted at 9 A.M. on the 25th to hear a message from the British Government.

3. On the 25th February the demands of the British Government were presented, and their tenour explained to Sheikh Esa at the Residency, Manamah, by Major Cox, copy attached.

4. At 3.45 P.M. Sheikh Esa requested Major Cox to help him to surround Sheikh Ali's house. This was promptly done, and an armed cutter to cover them was sent to "lay off" Ali's house. It was then found (5 P.M.) that Ali had fled at noon, after a visit paid to him by his brother-in-law, Abdullah-bin-Esa. His half brother, Hamid-bin-Esa, did not return from his garden near Ar Rufa until the evening of the 25th, and subsequent inquiries showed that Ali had fled to Ar Rufa, of which fortress his uncle Khalid is the Governor.

It was generally believed that Ali did not finally quit Bahrein for Al Katr until the 28th. His uncle Khalid arrived at Manamah at 10 A.M. on the 26th, but despite a night spent in chasing Ali (according to Sheikh Esa), he looked quite fresh, and only apparently desirous of hood-winking us. I can hardly believe that had Esa gone at once to Ali's house on receipt of the ultimatum on the 25th, he could not have detained him and the ten men, the majority of whom were followers of Ali.

5. At 8 A.M. on the 26th, each ship fired a blank charge, which was clearly seen by the towns of Manamah and Muharrag. At 8.30 Sheikh Esa arrived at the Agency with two bags of 1,000 rupees each, and a draft of his proposed notice on the "Sukhra" question. He stated "That despite all he could do, Ali and the ten men had left." He, however, failed to convince me that he had shown any hearty desire to detain them, and throughout the interview adopted a *non possumus* attitude.

6. The fact that Sheikh Esa had to some extent complied with our terms materially changed the situation; but, as he had also shown a considerable amount of ignorance, almost amounting to bad faith, and an intention to delay a settlement, the following further terms were then given to him:—

(i.) That Sheikh Hamid should go on board a man-of-war, and remain there as a mark of good faith, pending the capture of Ali, and the settlement of the original terms.

(ii.) To prevent delays, Sheikh Esa should reside at Manamah instead of Muharrag, during the visit of the Political Resident to Bahrein.

(iii.) Sheikh Ali's town house, furniture, boats, and animals should be given to the British Government.

(Copy attached.)

Item (iii) was agreed to after some demur, but numbers (i) and (ii) were only agreed to by a threat to open fire, and the destruction of all forts within an hour, unless Sheikh Hamid voluntarily surrendered. Upon his surrender at noon (26th), he was taken on board His Majesty's ship "Sphinx" by Commander Bowman, where he was allowed to employ four of his own domestics, and to see his friends at certain hours.

Sheikh Esa came over to Manamah on the 27th at 8.30 A.M., and lived with his son Abdullah, during the remainder of our stay at Bahrein.

7. His proximity to the Agency greatly facilitated all subsequent transactions, and prevented any delay which bad weather, by stopping communications between the islands, might have caused. His presence at Manamah also enabled pressure to be promptly applied to the Sheikhs or others who tried to obstruct us, or who declined to carry out our wishes.

At a port where shoals and reefs only permit of three hours' work a day near the shore, any obstruction that can be made by sheikhs or others, who refer you to a ruler resident at Muharrag, causes the loss of a tide, and is most prejudicial to business—e.g., on the 28th, when shipping Ali's camels, &c., the nakhodas of the dhows refused to move until specific orders were given by Sheikh Esa to do so.

8. Sheikh Abdullah was sent by Sheikh Esa to clear out the women and servants from Ali's house in Manamah on the 26th, which was then handed over to a guard of sepoys, a company of marines being landed to surround the house while this took place and withdrawn at sunset. On the 27th Sheikh Esa proclaimed Ali as an outlaw, and on the 28th his house was emptied, while his dhow and boat were burnt as a warning to the other Sheikhs.

9. A reward of 10,000 rupees was offered by Sheikh Esa for the apprehension of Sheikh Ali, and his delivery to any Political officer or man-of-war in the Persian Gulf, in order to prevent his intriguing with hostile Chiefs, or from carrying out piratical attacks upon the local traders.

10. Mullahs Jasim and Achmed were summoned to appear before Major Cox on the 27th, but despite an order from Sheikh Esa to do so, and a promise of safe conduct, Achmed fled, and only Jasim appeared on the 27th.

11. Mullah Jasim (often called locally "Sheikh"), however, paid several visits to Major Cox, and eventually to save his brother Achmed from being outlawed, gave himself up as a hostage, and was sent to "Sphinx" for safe custody. When on board he at once took precedence of Sheikh Hamid (Esa's son, and recognized successor), and in the two interviews I held, treated Hamid with scant ceremony.

12. Mullah Achmed's house was surrounded by marines on the 1st March after the women had been removed, but it was found to contain little else than books, so was left undisturbed.

13. On the 28th the new police force at Manamah were mustered near the Residency for Captain Prideaux' inspection. Their pay was then settled, sergeants selected, and their duties explained. The bazaar master, however, disclaimed all responsibility for breaches of the peace committed by sheikhs or their followers, and stated that Sheikh Esa had appointed another person to look after them.

14. At 8.30 A.M. on the 2nd March, accompanied by Major Cox, I called upon Sheikh Esa to say good-bye. We then met his son Abdullah and grandson (the eldest son of late Sheikh Salamah), also his brother Khalid, the Governor of Ar Rufa. The visit was a purely formal one, and Sheikh Esa had no complaints to make, nor news to give us of the persons that had fled.

I have, &c.

(Signed) J. B. EUSTACE,
Captain and Senior Naval Officer, Persian Gulf Division.

Inclosure 3 in No. 96.

Memorandum of Demands made by the Officiating Political Resident in the Persian Gulf upon Sheikh Esa-bin-Ali, Chief of Bahrein, by order of the Government of India, February 25, 1905.

I AM desired first to remind you of the long continued friendship and support which have been accorded by the British Government to the Rulers of Bahrein.

2. I have next to remind you that these favours have also been extended to you personally.

Upon the death of your father, Sheikh Ali-bin-Khalifah, the British Government caused the usurper, Muhammed-bin-Abdullah to be expelled, and yourself installed in your father's place. You have ever since received the support of the British Government.

[1517]

S

3. In February 1901 you were notified by the Resident that, in accordance with your express wish, the British Government recognized your son, Sheikh Hamid, as your successor to the Chieftainship.

4. They further offered you the services of a British officer to administer with more efficiency the customs of Bahrein. This offer you refused.

5. These are evidences of the friendly and benevolent spirit which has been consistently displayed towards you by the British Government. You owe, in the main, to them your present position, the means that you enjoy, and your continued occupation of the Chieftainship.

6. Notwithstanding these facts, and notwithstanding the assurances which have been given by you, especially on the occasion of the imprisonment in 1873 of a mail agent in the employ of a British trading Company, when you promised to abide "Inshalla" by the advice of the Political Resident, you have not maintained your friendship towards the British Government, and have conducted yourself in a manner which cannot be permitted to continue.

7. You have now refused to accept advice which I have repeatedly offered on behalf of the British Government, with a view to the amicable settlement of the difficulties which have arisen in connection with the recent assault by subjects of yours on certain Persians. The final reply given by you when I last visited you on the 8th December, 1904, was to the following effect: "I have only one answer to give, namely, that I will do nothing in this case except after trial by my own Shariat-ar-Urf Court." You were then informed why this procedure could not be agreed to, and though every consideration was shown to you, you still remained obdurate, and thus barred the way to a satisfactory conclusion being arrived at. You have also, in spite of my own repeated representations and those of the Assistant Political Agent at Bahrein, Captain Prideaux, entirely failed to keep under proper control your nephew, Sheikh Ali, who has undoubtedly been identified through his retainers with the present outrage on Persians, as well as the recent attack on the German, M. Bahinson, for the illegal application of Sukhra, or forced labour, on the employes of the German, M. Wanckhaus, and for the forcible removal from the British mail steamer "Kangra" of a certain baggalas last December for his own work.

8. Matters have now come to a point when the British Government can no longer, consistently with their own dignity and your permanent interests, discuss these matters with you, and I am therefore instructed to make the following demands upon you:—

(1.) I am to demand that six of the ringleaders in the attack against Persian subjects shall, after identification, be expelled from the island, and with them the four persons whom you expelled in connection with the German case, but who I learn have returned.

(2.) I am to demand that 2,000 rupees shall be paid as compensation to the Persians through the Assistant Political Agent, on account of the outrage committed on them.

(3.) I am to demand that you shall station a special guard of your own trusted men on duty in Manamah to maintain order in the bazaar.

(4.) I am to demand that Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed shall leave Bahrein forthwith, and that he shall not be permitted to return there for a period of five years, counting from the date on which he now leaves Bahrein.

(5.) I am to demand that the existing system of "sukhra," or forced labour, shall be stringently prohibited as far as employes of foreigners are concerned, and that a public notification to that effect shall be issued in terms to be approved by me.

(6.) Finally, I am to warn you that further rejection of advice in important matters will not be tolerated by Government, and that, in the event of any continuance or repetition of an unfriendly attitude on your part, all support and assistance, whether diplomatic or military, which you and your predecessors have enjoyed, will be withdrawn from you, and may possibly take another direction.

It is impossible for the British Government to continue their support and protection to a Chief who continues obdurate to all reasonable advice for his welfare, and assumes an unfriendly attitude towards their officers.

These are the demands of which the Government has instructed me to exact compliance. It will be necessary for you to comply with them by 9 A.M. to-morrow in the following manner:—

1. You will yourself meet me at 9 A.M. at the Agency, bringing with you one of

the copies of these terms, signed and sealed by yourself, as a proof that you have accepted the said terms.

2. You will bring with you at the same time a sum of 2,000 rupees, contained in two bags of 1,000 rupees each.

3. The following ten individuals, namely:—

- (1.) Hassam Baluch,
- (2.) Mahomed Tahir,
- (3.) Zaced-bin-Saad,
- (4.) Zaced-bin-Ferhan,
- (5.) Bakheet-el-Nubi,
- (6.) Mar Zook-bin-Ismael,
- (7.) Saad Kahtani,
- (8.) Alma,
- (9.) Miyelli,
- (10.) Baraitch-bin-Zaced,

are to be sent by you at the same hour to the Agency.

They will proceed straight from the Agency on to one of the men-of-war, which will convey them to Muscat, where they will be detained for a certain time, their maintenance expenses while at Muscat being paid by yourself.

4. Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, who, by the orders of Government, will be exiled from Bahrein for a period of five years, will also present himself at 9 A.M. at the Agency, with two or three private servants, who will accompany him; he will likewise proceed forthwith on to one of the men-of-war for conveyance to Muscat, where he will remain pending issue of orders or permission by Government for his departure to another place.

5. It will be necessary for you to publish a notice with regard to "Sukhra," and to bring with you a draft of it for inspection and approval by me before promulgation.

6. You must appoint fifty men from among your own reliable followers for the guarding of the Manamah bazaar, to be under the orders of the bazaar master; to muster the men before him at such times as he may desire, in order that he may verify their numbers.

All the above conditions must be fulfilled by you by 9 A.M. on the 26th February, and after the expiry of the time now given, no further law will be allowed you.

Accordingly, in order that you may have due warning, one hour before the expiry of the time, that is to say, at 8 A.M., each of the three men-of-war will fire one blank charge, so that you may know that there is only one more hour left of the time allowed to you for compliance.

In addition to this a man-of-war's boat will remain on duty off the Muharrag custom-house, in order to bring me any communication from you in the above connection, and this boat will stay there until the last moment possible.

As soon as the hour of 9 o'clock has passed, the boat will return to its man-of-war, and after that no further opportunity for communication will exist.

The above demands were presented and thoroughly explained by me to Sheikh Esa-bin-Ali this day, the 25th February, 1905, in the presence of Captain J. B. Eustace, R.N., Senior Naval Officer Persian Gulf Division.

(Signed) P. Z. COX,
Officiating Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.

(Translation.)

The Residency, Bahrein, February 26, 1905.

SEEING that the period given to you has passed, and that you have not produced the ten men required, and you inform me that Sheikh Ali has absconded from the island, and that you are unable to produce him—

After consultation with the officers commanding ships here, and the Political Agent—

We have decided, pending the intimation to the Government of what has taken place, to call upon you to send your son, Hamid, on to one of the men-of-war, to remain in the company of the commanding officer as a proof of your good intentions to fulfil the rest of the terms.

He will remain there pending a reply from the British Government for the final settlement of this matter.

Should there be any delay in receiving a reply, Hamid will be landed and suitably housed by the Resident.

(Signed) P. Z. COX,
Political Resident, Persian Gulf.

Inclosure 4 in No. 96.

Captain Eustace to Rear-Admiral Atkinson-Willes.

Sir,

"Fox," at Bombay, March 10, 1905.
I HAVE the honour to submit a report on the proceedings of His Majesty's ships "Fox," "Sphinx," and "Redbreast" at Bahrein, between the 22nd February and the 2nd March, 1905.

From information obtained from Lieutenant and Commander Hugh G. Somerville, it appeared that on Muharrak Island Sheikh Esa controlled 540 men armed with Martini rifles, while a large number of men armed with Arab guns might be expected to join him on Bahrein Island. If Sheikh Ali joined hands with his uncle Khalid, the Governor of Ar Rufa, he could place against us 500 riflemen, and a large body of men armed with native weapons.

The town of Muharrak is of considerable extent, with a labyrinth of small streets. Sheikh Esa usually resides there during the winter, in a house 600 yards distant from the usual landing-place. The population of Muharrak is entirely Arab, and no foreigners live there.

Manamah is the business and residential town for all foreigners in Bahrein, while Sheikh Esa resides there during the summer months. Sheikh Ali, who claims the Governorship of this town, lives in a large rambling house, with several courtyards on the sea-front. The fanatical Mullahs, Jasim and Achmed, also live there, while nearly every important house in Manamah belongs to a Sheikh, or member of the Utubi tribe.

In both towns are a large number of huts and mat-sheds, hence it is impossible to shell either, if a general conflagration is to be avoided. Since all those whom we might have to protect live scattered about in the town of Manamah, I deemed it necessary to detail the "Sphinx" and all marines to co-operate with the Resident guard for their protection. The remainder of the "Fox" and "Redbreast" crews were under orders to destroy Forts Bu Mahir, Arad, and Manamah on the signal being made to commence hostilities.

To attain these objects, the forces of Esa and Ali were kept apart by mooring "Redbreast" in Khor Kaliya, in such a position as to command Forts Bu Mahir, Arad, and Manamah without endangering the towns. His Majesty's ship "Sphinx" was moored off Sheikh Ali's house and in sight of Fort Manamah, which also could be shelled without risk to the town. His Majesty's ship "Fox" being 7,650 yards from Fort Manamah and 9,000 from Fort Arad, every available man was sent to the two former ships. Owing to bad weather, the shallow channels, and extensive reefs, the majority had to be at their posts before dark on the 25th, and slept in their blankets or great coats, until they returned to this ship on the 28th February or the 1st March.

On the 26th, at 8 A.M., a signal gun was fired by each ship to indicate that in one hour's time hostilities would commence.

At 8.30 Sheikh Esa arrived at the Residency, Manamah. As he evidently showed a desire to personally comply with the terms, so far as his family would permit, it was decided to coerce them, and the following measures were then undertaken:—

1. The seizure of Sheikh Ali's town house, furniture, boats, and animals.
2. The voluntary surrender of Sheikh Hamid as a hostage and as a sign of good faith.
3. That Sheikh Esa should reside at Manamah during our stay in order to facilitate any further questions that might arise.

Measures 2 and 3 were strongly resented. It was only by the threat of the destruction of all forts within an hour that Sheikh Hamid eventually surrendered and was sent on board His Majesty's ship "Sphinx" (copy of Agreement attached).

The marines were then landed and surrounded Ali's house, which was occupied by a sepoy's guard as soon as the women and domestics with their personal effects had left. After dark, on the 26th, the marines returned to "Sphinx," and during the night search-

lights were kept working upon the towns by "Fox" and "Redbreast," the want of one was very greatly felt in the "Sphinx."

On the 27th all Sheikh Ali's movable property was removed from his house, and on the 28th shipped for conveyance to Koweit, Bushire, and Muscat, while his boat and dhow were burned.

Since the turbulent Mullahs, Jasim and Achmed, have never called at the Residency, and were holding continuous services in their mosques, Sheikh Esa ordered them to call at once to meet the Political Resident. Mullah Achmed however fled, and his brother, Mullah Jasim, surrendered himself as a hostage, pending the return of Achmed, thus saving him from being outlawed and his property seized. The presence of a small body of marines that surrounded Mullah Achmed's house undoubtedly expedited this matter.

The authority of Sheikh Esa was, however, always requested, and his agents accompanied our working parties, while marines and sepoy covered them and overawed the mobs that gathered.

On the 25th Seedie Boy Maiden Haisa died at 10.45 P.M., but owing to the imminence of hostilities on the 26th the interment did not take place until the 27th, when it was quietly effected at Manamah by a friendly Mullah.

On the 1st March the marine company of the landing party was broken up and the marines returned to their respective ships. Their services had been required upon four occasions. Despite wet garments due to wading on shore over the reefs, and long hours in the rain and wind, they showed an excellent spirit, and proved themselves to be a very capable body.

The failure in several instances of the marines' boots is the subject of a special letter, while the discomfort that the absence of the marine servants caused to their respective masters is also referred to in my Report on the question of domestics.

His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" was withdrawn from the Khor Kaliya on the 1st March, where her presence, by preventing the forces of Muharrak and Manamah from combining, conducted very materially to the peaceful termination of these operations.

On the 2nd March, all details having rejoined their respective ships, and as Major Cox considered the presence of His Majesty's ship "Fox" was no longer necessary, I ordered Commander Bowman to resume his duties as Senior Naval Officer, Persian Gulf, and returned to Bombay, calling at Muscat on the 5th to coal and to land the furniture seized in Ali's house.

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. B. EUSTACE.

No. 97.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 4.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 2nd March, relative to the Political Agent at Koweit.

India Office, April 3, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 97.

Telegrams from and to Major Cox and Government of India.

[Not printed.]

Inclosure 2 in No. 97.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, February 5, 1905.

WITH reference to Foreign Department telegram, dated 23rd ultimo, regarding the attitude to be maintained by the Political Agent at Koweit towards Sheikh Mubarak's relations with Ibn Saood, I have the honour to report that I instructed Captain Knox in the terms of it, and he replies as follows in an informal communication, dated the 27th ultimo:—

"The warning was conveyed by me to Sheikh Mubarak at an interview on the afternoon of the 26th instant. He took it very well, and though I watched keenly for any sign of disappointment for irritation, I could not detect anything of the kind.

"He assured me that he was abiding by his promise, which he had not forgotten, and confirmed his words when he came to see me this morning, by a letter to your address, which he asked me to read."

In the letter referred to the Sheikh, while freely admitting the fact that Ibn Rashid is his enemy and Ibn Saood his good friend, to whom he wishes success, repeats his former promises to abstain from assisting him, and maintains that he has steadfastly kept his undertaking hitherto.

No. 98.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 4.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a letter from Major Cox, dated the 13th March, with inclosures, relative to the Muscat Arbitration.

India Office, April 3, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 98.

Major Cox to India Office.

Sir,

At Sea, March 13, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that I am by this mail forwarding to the Government of India my office letter dated the 12th instant, and a copy of the British and French Cases for The Hague Tribunal, with my pencil notes entered in the margins, and have been instructed by the Foreign Department to send you copies officially. This I have the honour to do herewith.

In order to make the most of the very short time at our disposal, I am now on the way to Muscat, where there is a fuller record than I have at Bushire, and shall address you again from there by next mail.

Meanwhile, I have the honour to suggest (and I have also done so to the Government of India) that we might properly use in our Counter-Case as a "communication" from the Sultan, the draft letter, of which a translation was forwarded to the Government of India with my telegram of the 17th May. The Sultan of Muscat could not repudiate it, and, apart from its exposition of his wishes, it would be a useful proof of the fact that when he went to Soor in June 1900 he had no intention of attempting to coerce the Soori flag-holders, and that it was simply the fortuitous presence there of the Bedouin Sheikh Abdulla-bin-Salim, and the latter's practical influence with the Sooris, that brought about the written undertaking to resign their French papers, which they executed and handed to the Sultan on this occasion.

I have, &c.
(Signed) P. Z. COX.

Inclosure 2 in No. 98.

Political Agent, Muscat, to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Karachi, May 17, 1900.

PLEASE refer to correspondence regarding French flag.

On the 28th May, 1897, Sultan of Muscat forwarded communication asking for "the help and consideration of Her Majesty's Government in putting an end to the difficulty." Lord Salisbury, however, held that Her Majesty's Government had no *locus standi* upon which to approach French Government, seeing that they had received no request from Sultan of Muscat to do this. Sultan of Muscat has now put in my hand the draft of a letter couched in the following terms, and will sign it on hearing that it is sufficient for the purpose, and will doubtless make no difficulty about making any slight alterations in the wording of it which may be considered advisable:—

"I have the honour to address you regarding the matter of the French flags, which are handed about among my subjects, inhabitants of Soor, and elsewhere. You are cognizant of the circumstances of the case, and we have many times discussed the question, and I am much vexed with regard to it, as it is detrimental both to my independence and to my prestige. Moreover, quite lately, as you are probably aware of, there have been quarrels among sections of my subjects over this matter, in that the tribe of Hijraeen called upon the Jennebeh, inhabitants of Soor, in a threatening missive to return their French papers, and I fear that harm may result. I never cease to be distracted by this matter of the French flag, and I have many times called upon the French Consul to represent the matter to his Government, and to explain to them fully my wishes, and to obtain from them a plain answer; but up to the present time I have obtained nothing tangible from him, and the practice has not been put an end to. Now I am aware that it is the custom for political questions between your two great Governments in these parts to be discussed and settled by communication between the high officials of your respective Governments in Europe. I therefore now write to say that, if your great Government can see the way to discuss the question with the great French Government on my behalf, with a view to effecting the removal of the flags now in use and the discontinuance of the practice, I shall be extremely grateful and obliged."

Inclosure 3 in No. 98.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Sir,

Bushire, March 12, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Foreign Department communications detailed in the margin.* Owing to my absence at Bahrein, the second item reached me before I had time to express my views on the first.

2. Referring to the Secretary of State's telegram of the 17th February, of which the purport was received with the first communication above mentioned, I am not sure that I follow his observations regarding the non-inclusion of the Sultan's name in future documents. Thus, if we now cease formally to couple the name of the Sultan with ours, in what other way, which a judicial tribunal would recognize, can we maintain that his Highness is really the party chiefly interested in the suit.

As the Attorney-General has expressed a decided opinion on the point, I naturally hesitate to waste the time of Government by venturing mine, but after studying the French case I cannot help having misgivings.

Their statement seems to consist mainly of a comprehensive and often irrelevant impeachment of the whole of our policy in the Gulf; and one of the chief points which they endeavour to make is that it is not, and never has been, the Sultan who has brought on this issue but the British Government, who, for their own purposes, are using him as a stalking-horse. They go on to argue that the suit really lies purely between the Governments of Great Britain and France, and then introduce diverse evidence to prove that in the matter of ignoring the Declaration of 1862 we are infinitely worse offenders than they are themselves.

* Telegram dated February 23; telegram dated March 7; letter dated February 28, 1905.

3. Such being the case, and if in future we drop all formal joinder of the Sultan's name, might it not be possible for the Tribunal to hold, if they were so minded, that the case, as submitted to them, was entirely as between the British and French Governments, the Sultan not being interested?

They might then decide that, as between the actual parties to the suit, the French had been no worse offenders in the matter of their flag than we had in many parallel matters, and so pronounce an open verdict.

The Sultan of Muscat would then be no better off, and would be left to fight it out with the French as best he could, we having been deprived of any further status to act in his behalf.

I had, as a matter of fact, been under the impression all along that the French had throughout the negotiations quite recognized the fact that we had the Sultan's brief, and that they had consented to negotiate with us on that understanding.

4. The Government of India will realize that their letter of the 28th February, received by the last mail steamer, has given me very little opportunity to deal with the French case, but in order to make the most of the time, I am leaving for Muscat by the same mail which takes this letter. One of the copies of the French case, with such marginal notes as I have been able to make within the time, will, I hope, reach Calcutta by the same mail as this, and the other I will post from Muscat after seeing Major Grey and filling in from Agency records what I cannot answer from those available to me here.

5. I shall hope to obtain from the Sultan the written application suggested to me in paragraph 2 of your letter No. 850 E. B.

6. I have one or two points to mention which I think might have been, and perhaps might now be, made use of:—

(a.) No capital, or even mention, has been made of the capture of a Soori slaving fleet in Mozambique waters by the Portuguese, in March 1902.

Seven hundred odd slaves were rescued, and about 150 Sooris killed or captured.

It will be seen from my Muscat letter No. 395, dated the 12th September, 1902, that some of the Arabs apparently did try to claim French protection.

But apart from this it is important as showing that the slave-trade to Soor flourished up till quite lately almost to as great an extent as ever, in spite of French Consular reports to the contrary, and also as demonstrating, if any demonstration were wanted, that Soor, the place of origin of all these French protégés, can boast of one of the most depraved communities on the face of the earth. It is from such a place that France has elected to recruit her "ressortissants."

(b.) Similarly it might be pointed out, without suggesting that any French protégés were concerned, that the inhabitants of Maseera Island, who lately massacred a shipwrecked crew under most barbarous circumstances, are of the same tribe, the Jenebeh, as that to which many of the flag-holders belong.

Many of the residents of Soor are related to and intermarried with inhabitants of Maseera, and there is constant intercourse between the island and Soor, and as will be seen from the Customs returns furnished to the Sultan by the Bombay Government, Maseera is to a large extent supplied with food by the dhows of the French protégés. I am speaking with knowledge though from memory, but will check this statement by inspection of the returns at Muscat.

(c.) Referring to the Debai case, mentioned on p. 21 of our statement, I note that one important detail has been overlooked, namely, that M. Laronce in preferring his official claim to the Chief of Debai, still used the name of the original man, Salim-bin-Mahomed, although Salim had been dead two years and M. Laronce knew it, as he had corresponded with Seyyid Feisal about his effects. I have M. Laronce's original letter.

7. I shall submit a further communication from Muscat, and if it is not in time to catch this mail it will be sent direct to the Political Secretary, India Office, copy being forwarded to Calcutta simultaneously.

I have, &c.
(Signed) P. Z. COX.

No. 99.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 4.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated to-day, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, April 4, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 99.

Mr. Fitzmaurice to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 11.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

April 4, 1905.

ADEN delimitation. Turkish Commissioner has now received a reply to his telegrams referred to in my Nos. 7 and 9. Purport of this telegram (which he has shown to me in confidence) is as follows:—

He is authorized—(1) to recognize Aulaki, with its dependencies, as one of the nine cantons; and (2) to accept definition of the line of boundary to the north-east as, in general, a straight line to the desert. As regards the four places, his instructions are that in the event of my wishing to insert them specifically in the proceedings he is to object, but he is given discretionary power to conclude a definitive settlement if I agree to it. Meaning of this is that, if I forego claim to Juban, Turkish Commissioner can give up claims to the other three places. (*Vide* my telegram No. 7, paragraphs 3 and 4.) I shall be glad to be informed whether there is any objection to my foregoing claim to Juban.

I am proceeding this evening on a few days' visit to Aden, at the request of the Governor of Bombay, who arrives there to-morrow.

(Repeated to Viceroy, Foreign Department, and Secretary of State for India.)

No. 100.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 4.)

(No. 64.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, April 4, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr. Fitzmaurice's telegram No. 11 of the 4th April on the subject of Aden (communicated to Foreign Office by India Office, the 4th April); the Ottoman Commissioner's suggested compromise would seem advantageous, as far as the information in our possession enables me to judge.

No. 101.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, April 4, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th ultimo relative to the arrangements proposed by the Government of India for the temporary withdrawal of Captain Knox from Koweit.

Lord Lansdowne concurs in the proposed arrangements, and will cause the necessary steps to be taken to enable Captain Knox to act as Vice-Consul at Ahwaz when Mr. Lorimer proceeds on leave.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

74

No. 102.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 5)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 4th April, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, April 5, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 103.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

April 4, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

ADEN delimitation: My telegram of the 27th ultimo.
Resident at Aden telegraphs as follows.—

"Fitzmaurice strongly advocates pillars being erected at Sheikh Saïd only. A couple of pillars would be all that would be required there, and no escort would be needed for erecting them. The remainder of the boundary, throughout its whole length (60 miles) follows well-defined natural features, and Fitzmaurice deprecates construction of demarcation pillars along it. I recommend Fitzmaurice's suggestion for adoption. Should it, however, be decided by Government to erect pillars along the whole line of boundary, the completion of the work would take six weeks, and, in order both to furnish escort and to provide for line of communication, a detachment of 300 men, with complement of officers, would have to be employed. These I should be unable to supply locally. I am informed by Fitzmaurice that no survey officers would in any case be required."

In view of the fact that the country with which we are brought into contact by the adoption of the Mudariba-Sheikh Saïd line is not actually occupied by the Turks, and is not to be alienated to other Powers at any time, the Government of India are inclined to share Fitzmaurice's opinion, in which the Government of Bombay also concur, viz., that pillars are unnecessary. But, whatever view be taken as to the ultimate necessity for demarcation, we deprecate the risk and expense which would be entailed by employment of a large force now, in view of the commencement of the hot season. The present operations should be limited, in our opinion, to the erection of the two pillars required at Sheikh Saïd. Fitzmaurice reports, under date the 24th March, that Turkish Commissioner considers pillars unnecessary, and, in view of the present disturbed state of Yemen, there might be difficulty in arranging for his Turkish escort, so that postponement of demarcation is likely to be acceptable to the Turks.

(Repeated to Bombay and Aden.)

No. 103.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 6.)

(A.) THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 2nd March, relative to representations from the Sheikh of Koweit, regarding the deportation to Constantinople of certain Arabs in whom he is interested.

India Office, April 5, 1905.

75

Inclosure 1 in No. 103.

*Major Cox to Government of India.**Bushire, February 12, 1905.*

I HAVE the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copies of the correspondence on the subject of the deportation to Constantinople of certain Arabs in whom the Sheikh is interested.

2. In view of the terms of the reply of His Britannic Majesty's Consul, Bussorah, it does not appear to me that I can do any more in the matter, and I therefore refer it to the Government of India for any action that they may feel called upon to take.

I shall duly report any information on the subject that I may receive from the Political Agent, Koweit.

Inclosure 2 in No. 103.

*Captain Knox to Major Cox.**Koweit, January 23, 1905.*

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith the translation of a letter received from Sheikh Mubarek in which he complains of the arrest of the Bussorah agent of one of his influential Nejd friends who handles most of Sheikh Mubarek's business.

2. The firm of Ul-Khathair to which Fahad-bin-Khalid, also mentioned in the letter, belongs is the most wealthy house in Koweit.

3. The news of the arrest of these people had reached me two days before Sheikh Mubarek's letter came, and I had noted in a draft for my weekly diary that it was reported that they had been arrested at the instance of Ibn Rashid, who is said to have managed to get the orders issued at Constantinople.

4. The explanation of the whole affair, according to Koweit opinion, is as follows:—

The local Turkish official, his Excellency the Vali of Bussorah, a friend of Sheikh Mubarek, was making an honest attempt to solve the Nejd affair, in the best interests of his own Government at least, by coming to terms with Ibn Saood. As all influential people in Nejd were tired of the constant fighting and anarchy that has prevailed there for the last five years, and as Sheikh Mubarek and Ibn Saood were forced to defer to public opinion and give up the hopes of British protection for Ibn Saood, his Excellency's efforts promised to be successful. This solution meant nothing less than the extinction of Ibn Rashid, who directed this last blow at Sheikh Mubarek to destroy all chance of a successful meeting at Sefwan.

5. It is reported here that on receipt of the orders to imprison the merchants his Excellency telegraphed a remonstrance on the ground that the men were respectable and influential merchants. He received a reply to say that they must be sent at once to Constantinople. The men start immediately.

6. The Sheikh was, I hear, much disturbed at the news of the arrest of these men, and the report is, to my mind, confirmed by this letter which was brought to me by his confidential Secretary, who had evidently received orders to explain the matter to me thoroughly, and to do all he could to induce me to take the warmest interest in the case. The tone of the letter is quite different from any I have hitherto received from the Sheikh. It reads more like an Indian Petition than an Arabic letter.

7. I asked Mullah Abdullah whether Sheikh Mubarek would go to Sefwan after all, and he said, "Yes." There was a distinct note of fretfulness when he said, "The great Government is too far away to look after us. We don't know what its policy is. Meshed Ali (Nejef) is full of soldiers, and the Nejd people are tired of this everlasting fighting. They don't know how to feed and clothe their children. Nothing but fighting." He went on to tell me how Sheikh Mubarek hated the Turks, and that Ibn Saood's coming had been delayed, but that the latest news was that he was due at Jahra on the 27th instant, and that Nasir-bin-Saood, the messenger whose arrival here was reported in my diary under date the 18th January, was now in Bussorah.

8. The immediate object of the Sheikh's letter may possibly be attained by the good offices of His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Bussorah, but it is difficult to know

bat to suggest as a remedy for these constant skilfully-disguised attacks aimed at heikh Mubarek as a punishment for having sought our protection.

9. There remains nothing for me to add except that I saw Sheikh Mubarek on the morning of the 23rd instant. He confirmed all that has been said above without my asking for confirmation, except that when I asked if Ibn Saood would go to Sefwan he said that he was not sure, that both Ibn Saood and the people of Aneyza would be greatly alarmed at the turn things have taken, and that unless some measures were taken to counteract the latest move of the Turks, or rather, as he put it, of Ibn Rashid and Yusuf-bin-Brahim, Ibn Saood would return direct to Nejd, the Turkish troops would march from Nejd Ali, and Nejd would again be plunged into war. He said apparently quite seriously that if his Excellency's advice was not taken with regard to local matters of this kind he ought to resign.

10. Incidentally it may be of interest to note that he contrasted the behaviour of the Indian Government, who allowed Yusuf-el-Brahim's Bombay house to trade in perfect security in spite of the fact that Yusuf's men had fired on the crew of a British man-of-war, wounding two men, and that of the Turkish Government, who, on the accusation of men like Ibn Rashid and Yusuf-el-Brahim, threw the affairs of an important mercantile firm into confusion.

He again impressed upon me the fact that Yusuf-el-Brahim, who, it was arranged, should stay at the Hejjaz, was back in Nejed (Meshed Ali) in close communication with the Mushir of Bagdad, and doing all the mischief he could.

Inclosure 3 in No. 103.

Sheikh Mubarek to Captain Knox.

(Translation.)

(After compliments.)

15 Zi-ul-Kada, 1322 (January 22, 1905).

SULEIMAN-US-SHUBEYLI is an influential merchant in Bussorah, and he lives himself in the town of Aneyzah (Nejd), and his relation, Hamid-ul-Hammad, is his Bussorah agent. This man, Suleiman-us-Shubeyli, is an able man and a manager of important affairs. For some years there have been business relations between him and myself, and besides one of my own subjects, a merchant Fahad-ul-Khalid-ul-Khazavi is in business relations with him and his partner and friend; and the bulk of the trading moneys of the aforesaid house are to return to me and Fahad-ul-Khalid.

Now Hamid-ul-Hammad, who is agent for Suleiman-us-Shubeyli, has been seized by the Turkish Government, and they have imprisoned him on receipt of an order that they should take him away to Constantinople.

This merchandize is the most of it ours, and the money that belongs to us and to Fahad-ul-Khalid is about 1,00,000 reals (9,000l.), and the business relations between us can be verified from the account-books in the house.

Now the house is empty, and no one is looking after the property and offices.

Hamid-ul-Hammad has given the keys to Farhan, the son of Fahad-ul-Khalid, in Bussorah, and Farhan also is afraid even to open the house. He only keeps the keys with him, and looks after matters from a distance, but does not take care of them.

Now our affairs are in danger, and Hamid-ul-Hammad has just sent a letter to Fahad-ul-Khalid asking him to look after his affairs, appointing him his sole agent, and saying that he should send one of his brothers or that Farhan is present in Bussorah.

Now we, from the practices of seditious evil-workers, our enemies, and the listening of the Turkish Government to their false inventions, are unable to appoint Farhan or any one of the brothers of Fahad. We fear lest afterwards they should seize him—except with the written consent of the Vali of Bussorah, that the man should arrange the affairs of the house or manage the merchandize, or rather gather the things and account-books together and bring them to Koweit. And we inform you of everything that happens to us. This Petition was necessary, and in your high sight is sufficient, and may you remain guarded.

Inclosure 4 in No. 103.

Major Cox to Consul Monahan.

Bushire, February 1, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward a translation of a letter, dated the 22nd January, addressed by the Sheikh of Koweit to Captain S. G. Knox, complaining of the arrest of the Bussorah agent of his friend Suleiman-bin-Shubeyli, a merchant who handles some of Mubarek's money, and who is also in partnership with one of the latter's subjects.

I shall be glad if you will be so good as to let me have any information which you can obtain in corroboration of this complaint, or otherwise, and trust that if there appear to you to be grounds for it you will use your good offices with the local authorities or communicate with His Majesty's Ambassador on the subject.

Inclosure 5 in No. 103.

Consul Monahan to Major Cox.

Bussorah, February 4, 1905.

WITH reference to your letter of the 1st instant, I have the honour to inform you that, as I reported on the 22nd ultimo to His Majesty's Embassy, Hamid-al-Hammad and two other Nejd merchants were on that day or a day or two before shipped for Bagdad for giving information to Ibn Saood about Turkish military preparations. There is no doubt that the three had been in constant communication with Ibn Saood. I have not heard of the business relations with Sheikh Mubarek, but am inquiring.

No. 104.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 6.)

(B.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosure in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 9th March, relative to the repayment of the loan to the Sheikh of Koweit.

India Office, April 5, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 104.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Sir,

Bushire, February 11, 1905.

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with my letter, dated the 23rd July, 1904, reporting the payment of the loan of 1 lakh of rupees to Sheikh Mubarak of Koweit, I have the honour to report that the Sheikh has given me a bill for the said amount drawn on his Bombay Agent, named Salin-al-Abdullah-al-Sederawi, in repayment of the loan.

I have forwarded the bill to the Accountant-General, Bombay, for collection, and have asked that officer to place the amount when collected to the credit of the Government of India under foreign remittances.

I have, &c.
(Signed) P. Z. COX.

No. 105.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 6.)

(C.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 9th ultimo, relative to the imprisonment of the Bussorah Agent of the Sheikh of Koweit.

India Office, April 5, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 105.

*Major Cox to Government of India.**Bushire, February 18, 1905.*

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with Mr. Townley's despatch, dated the 28th November, 1904, of which a printed copy was received with Foreign Department indorsement, dated the 13th January, 1905, I have the honour to forward, for information, the purport of an informal reminder which I ventured to send to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires, Constantinople, and of his reply, dated the 13th and 14th February respectively.

2. It will be seen therefrom that the efforts of His Majesty's Embassy to effect the release of Sheikh Mubarek's Agent, Abdul Aziz-bin-Salim, in connection with the Bairam Id have been unsuccessful.

Inclosure 2 in No. 105.

Major Cox to Mr. Townley.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, February 13, 1905.

WITH reference to previous correspondence, the proximity of the Bairam Id prompts me to express hope that inclusion of the name of Sheikh Mubarek's Agent among cases deserving of clemency on this occasion may not be forgotten.

Inclosure 3 in No. 105.

Mr. Townley to Major Cox.

(Telegraphic.)

Constantinople, February 14, 1905.

YOUR telegram of yesterday.

Our action had no result at the first Bairam beyond an order issued by the Grand Vizier to the effect that Abdul Aziz-bin-Salim should receive lenient prison treatment.

I fear the circumstances have not changed sufficiently to warrant the hope that a renewed appeal to-day would meet with any better success.

No. 106.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 6.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 9th March, relative to the application by a native of Bahrein to the Bombay Government for a passport to proceed on a pilgrimage to Kerbela.

India Office, April 5, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 106.

Government of Bombay to Government of India.

Sir,

Bombay Castle, January 24, 1905.

ONE Salim-bin-Mahomed, a native of Bahrein, applied to this Government on the 21st November, 1904, for a passport, stating that he was proceeding on a pilgrimage to Kerbela. His application was referred to the Commissioner of Police, Bombay, for report, and a copy of that officer's report is forwarded herewith. Salim-bin-Mahomed's statement that he is a native of Bahrein is corroborated by two residents of this city, but as it has always been the practice of this Government to grant passports only to the following three classes of persons, viz. :—

- (1.) British subjects;
- (2.) British subjects by naturalization;
- (3.) Subjects of protected native States in India;

the applicant's request to be granted a passport was negatived.

2. I am, however, to inquire whether in future the Governor-General in Council would be prepared to view with approval the grant to Bahrein subjects of passports similar to those granted to subjects of protected States in India.

I have, &c.
(Signed) C. H. HILL.

Below Government Memorandum dated November 23, 1904.

No. 13565/14 of 1904.

Inclosure 2 in No. 106.

Mr. H. G. Gell to Government of Bombay.

*Police Commissioner's Office, Bombay,
December 1, 1904.*

THE Undersigned has the honour to report that the applicant is an Arab Mahomedan of the Shiah faith, and is 35 years of age. He makes the following statement, which is corroborated by another Arab named Abdur Razzak-bin-Abdul Mohsin, a dealer in pearls, who has been visiting Bombay off and on for the last twenty years, and also by a Suni Mahomedan named Haji Mahomed Musa, who resides in Bombay and is the manager of a mosque at Nagdevi Street :—

"I was born at Bahrein, in the Persian Gulf, and so were my father and ancestors. I came to Bombay with my father, Mahomed-bin-Ali, about thirty years ago. My father, who kept a coffee-shop at Nagdevi Street, died in Bombay about twelve or thirteen years ago. I am a hawker in gold and silver rings set with various kinds of stones. I am a married man, and live with my wife at Nagdevi Street. I intend proceeding on a pilgrimage to Kerbela via Bagdad, in Turkish Arabia, accompanied by my wife named Luluwa, aged 21 years, and born in Bagdad. She is of the same caste and creed as I am. I have sufficient funds to defray my journey expenses."

(Signed) H. G. GELL,
Commissioner of Police.

Inclosure 3 in No. 106.

Government of India to Government of Bombay.

Sir,

Fort William, March 9, 1905.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th January on the subject of the grant of passports to natives of Bahrein.

The Government of India approve the action of the Government of Bombay in

refusing to comply with an application for the grant of a British passport made by one Salim-bin-Mahomed, a native of Bahrein.

2. With reference to paragraph 2 of your letter, I am to say that should the Government of India hereafter consider any change in the practice of the Bombay Government to be desirable, a further communication will be addressed to you.

I have, &c.

(Signed) L. RUSSELL,
Deputy Secretary to Government of India.

No. 107.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 10.)

(No. 203.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, April 2, 1905.

I HAD the honour last night to reply to your Lordship's telegram No. 32 of that day's date, and to state that I had no doubt it was already quite clear that the undertaking given by the Ottoman Government not to alienate the territory adjoining the frontier-line from Mudariba to Sheikh Mirad comprised the territory which we claimed to belong to the Subaihi territory extending to Kuddam.

In order, however, to leave no possible doubt about the question, I got the Minister for Foreign Affairs to send me a written communication, of which I inclose herewith a copy, in answer to a *pro-memorandum* addressed to them, of which likewise a copy is inclosed, stating that their previous Declaration of the 29th December, 1904, covered the 550 square miles referred to in my Memorandum of the 11th August, of which a copy was inclosed to your Lordship in my despatch No. 646 of the 12th August, 1904.

I venture to think, however, that the India Office exaggerate the importance to be attached to this Declaration, inasmuch as its original object was to prevent the construction at some future time by another Power of a canal from Khor Gorera to Sheikh Mirad, and that when it was settled that the frontier ended at Sheikh Mirad instead of at Jebel Hosisi we practically removed all danger on this score, if indeed it ever existed, of which I am sceptical.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure 1 in No. 107.

Pro-memorandum addressed to Sublime Porte.

DANS le télégramme adressé, le 28 Shubat, 1320, au Gouverneur-Général du Yémen relativement à la délimitation des Cantons de Subaihi et de Yaffai, copie duquel a été communiquée à l'Ambassade Britannique par la note verbale de la Sublime Porte du 14 Mars, 1905, mention est faite de la condition que le Gouvernement Ottoman s'engage à ne pas céder à une autre Puissance quelconque "le territoire appartenant à la ligne aboutissant à Cheikh Mirad," ligne qui est actuellement adoptée comme frontière entre le Vilayet de Yémen et le Canton de Subaihi.

L'attention de l'Ambassade a été tirée sur les malentendus qui pourraient surgir du manque de précision de cette phrase.

Il est entendu qu'en parlant du "territoire appartenant à la ligne aboutissant à Cheikh Mirad" la Sublime Porte, ainsi que l'Ambassade, a voulu désigner le territoire, large à peu près de 550 milles carrés, se trouvant entre la ligne aboutissant à Cheikh Mirad et celle antérieurement proposée par le Commissaire Britannique comme frontière véritable du Canton Subaihi, et qui aboutit à la mer près de Kuddam.

Pour éviter pourtant toute possibilité de malentendu à l'avenir, il serait à désirer que la Sublime Porte veuille bien notifier par écrit que cette interprétation est conforme à la vérité.

Constantinople, le 1^{er} Avril, 1905.

Inclosure 2 in No. 107.

Note by Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs.

EN réponse au *pro-memorandum* de l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté Britannique en date d'aujourd'hui, le Ministère des Affaires Étrangères a l'honneur de lui faire observer que les instructions données au Gouverneur-Général du Vilayet du Yémen par le télégramme Véziriel du 28 Février, 1320, en ce qui concerne le territoire appartenant à la ligne qui aboutit à Cheikh Mirad, sont conformes à la Déclaration contenue dans sa communication en date du 29 Décembre, 1904, Déclaration qui, naturellement, comprend le territoire de 550 milles carrés mentionnés dans le *pro-memorandum* précité.

Le 1^{er} Avril, 1905.

No. 108.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 10.)

(No. 207.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, April 4, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch which I have received from Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell, Military Attaché to this Embassy, reporting on the dispatch of eight Redif battalions from Jerusalem to the Yemen, and on the strength of the Turkish force on the Egyptian frontier.

I am sending the extract from Colonel Maunsell's despatch, relative to the latter subject, to His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General at Cairo.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 108.

Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 9.)

Sir,

Jaffa, March 22, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that the eight battalions of the Jerusalem Redif Brigade left about three weeks ago for service in the Yemen, going by way of the Mecca Railway to Akaba, where they embarked on transports.

Two battalions from the southern part of this province—i.e., Ghaza and Khan Yunus—marched direct from Ghaza to Akaba, the season being now favourable for marching, and they covered the distance in seven days.

The remainder marched from Jerusalem eastward to Amman and other stations on the railway.

Clothing was only available for about half the men from the local depôts, and equipment was entirely wanting. Their rifles—the small-calibre Mauser—and clothing were sent direct by rail from the central dépôt at Damascus, and met them at Akaba.

When mobilized the battalions numbered 700 to 750, but service was most unpopular and desertions were frequent, so that on arrival at Akaba the average strength was not more than 600 per battalion.

The men were forbidden to offer the usual sum of £ T. 50 exemption money to avoid Redif service or to provide a substitute. Ali Pasha, commanding the brigade, is said to have made a good deal of money by secretly taking exemption fees and accepting as substitutes men who were unfit for military service.

This seems incredible for a commander who hoped to lead these men in the field, but apparently he, too, thought that he would manage to evade service.

It was proposed to bring him to trial, as direct evidence was obtained of his proceedings, but the matter was hushed up, and he has now gone at the head of his brigade to the Yemen.

The Mutessarif of Jerusalem, and the Chief Staff Officer now acting as Commandant there, said that it was under consideration to make a branch of the Hejaz Railway from Maan to Akaba, to get over the difficulties of marching troops over this distance.

However, work is now progressing on the main line to Medina.

[1517]

Y

There was no recent news available of the progress of events in the Yemen, or of the movement to relieve Sanaa, but the authorities seemed very anxious regarding the course of the campaign. The Chief Staff Officer informed me that an expedition was also projected to restore Turkish authority in Assir, where, since the disaster of November 1903, the country has been in the hands of the local tribes, the troops on the coast at Kumfida representing the only Turkish force in the country.

Ebha, the capital, had fallen into the hands of the rebels, and the Kumfida force had never been able to move inland owing to difficulties of transport.

Most of these troops, being urgently required in the Yemen, had now been transferred to Hodeida, and had gone inland towards Sanaa.

Riza Bey also mentioned that the son of the late Sheikh Hamid-ed-Din, Sheikh Muhammad Yahia, was the leader of the revolt, and had now a considerable force which had managed to possess itself of some artillery.

The Egyptian frontier of this district from Akaba to the Mediterranean is watched by a force of Zaptiehs, whose principal centre is Bir Seba (Beersheba), where, since the establishment of the post three years ago, forty to fifty Zaptiehs, mounted on camels and armed with Remington carbines, have been maintained.

A detachment of sixty Nizam infantry and a Redif dépôt are maintained at Ghaza, and these are the only Turkish forces near the Egyptian frontier.

The Kaïmakam of Jaffa mentioned that it was proposed to construct a metalled carriage road to Ghaza from either Jaffa or Ramle, but owing to drift sand construction would be difficult, and no decision had yet been arrived at. He also mentioned that the Mutessarif of Jerusalem proposed visiting Ghaza this summer to study the question.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. R. MAUNSELL,
Lieutenant-Colonel,
Military Attaché.

No. 109.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 10.)

(No. 213.)
My Lord.

Constantinople, April 4, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 187 of the 21st ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship further paraphrases of telegrams which I have recently addressed to Mr. Fitzmaurice on the subject of the Aden frontier delimitation.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure 1 in No. 109.

Sir N. O'Connor to Mr. Fitzmaurice.

(No. 10.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 23, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram of the 20th instant.

You are authorized to sign *procès-verbal* and map with Ottoman Commissioner in the event of map and survey of southern frontier being completed.

Inclosure 2 in No. 109.

Sir N. O'Connor to Mr. Fitzmaurice.

(No. 11.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 25, 1905.

WITH reference to your yesterday's telegram No. 9.

In the list of nine cantons communicated in 1873 to Porte, and also in that presented in consequence of your telegram No. 29 of the 7th September, 1903, Aulaki was included. Moreover, Iradé of February 1903 leaves no doubt on the subject.

No. 110.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 10.)

(No. 214.)

My Lord.

Constantinople, April 4, 1905.

WITH reference to previous reports on the subject of the insurrection in the Yemen, I have the honour to inform your Lordship, in confirmation of my telegram No. 60 of the 1st instant, that Sana'a was relieved on the 28th ultimo. No details have as yet reached me, and, beyond the news that Kataba is besieged by the insurgents, I have received no further information respecting the military operations.

As regards the movements of troops, I learn from Beyrout that 2,025 Redifs, of whom 275 came from Constantinople and the rest from Tripoli in Syria, left the first-named port for the Red Sea on the 17th ultimo. His Majesty's Consul at Damascus reports that in all 20 battalions, of which 8 were Nizams and 12 Redifs, have proceeded thence to the Yemen via Akaba.

It has, however, been decided to send no further troops by that route, and twelve more battalions of Redifs will be sent by sea, of which eight are going from Akka and four from Tripoli. Mr. Richardson reported from Hodeida on the 30th ultimo that 3,500 troops had arrived there, and I learn from Mr. Devey at Jeddah that a ship left that place on the 1st instant with 1,200 troops.

I may also mention in this connection that Mr. Graves reports from Salonica that the 33rd and 34th Regiments belonging to the 17th Brigade, whose head-quarters are at Nasselitch, have been called out in order to replace an equal force of Nizam infantry, now serving on the Greek frontier, which it is proposed to send to the Yemen.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 110^a.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 10.)

(No. 223.)

My Lord.

Constantinople, April 4, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegrams Nos. 56 and 58 of the 21st and 25th ultimo, I have the honour to report that on the 29th ultimo the Minister of War telegraphed to the Ottoman Aden Frontier Commissioners repeating his instructions to accept the insertion in the *procès-verbal* of our claim to Dabbiani, Juban, Naawa, and Rubaiyatein as being dependencies of the Canton Yaffai, and further authorizing them to recognize the Aulaki as one of the nine cantons.

On the same day, however, he received a telegram from the Commissioners raising two fresh points: the first a proposal made by Mr. Fitzmaurice to substitute in the clause relative to the non-alienation of that part of the Subaili territory of which we recognize the Turkish occupation, the words "territory between the two lines" for "territory adjoining the line terminating at Sheikh Mirad"; and the second, Mr. Fitzmaurice's declaration that the proposal that neither party should send troops into the nine cantons, was one that could not be taken into consideration. The Commissioners, therefore, asked for instructions as to their attitude on these two points.

On the following day Mr. Lamb learnt at the office of the Grand Vizier that a letter was about to be sent to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs asking that these two points should be discussed with the Embassy, and, having in mind the extreme difficulty which has so constantly confronted us of making the details of this question clear to the numerous Departments through which the correspondence has passed, I considered it inexpedient at this stage to introduce any changes into the wording of our proposals which have been repeatedly recorded in the same words. The expression "the territory between the two lines" conveys no meaning to the Departments, whereas they have at last come to understand what we mean by demanding that the "territory adjoining the line terminating at Sheikh Mirad" should not be ceded to any third Power, and any attempt to change the accepted phraseology now would be sure to lead to further trouble and misunderstanding.

Mr. Lamb succeeded in inducing the Grand Vizier not to refer to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, but to instruct the Minister of War to send orders to the Commis-

sioners that "the question of sending troops into the nine cantons was one with which they had nothing to do since it had been disposed of between the Embassy and the Porte, while as to the non-alienation clause they were to abide by the instructions already sent."

I accordingly sent to Mr. Fitzmaurice, in reply to his telegram No. 10 of the 27th ultimo, repeated by him to your Lordship, the telegram, of which a paraphrase is inclosed herewith

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 110*.

Sir N. O'Connor to Mr. Fitzmaurice.

(No. 13.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, March 30, 1905.

WITH reference to your telegram No. 10 of the 27th instant, I see no necessity for seeking to modify instructions to Ottoman Commissioner, as there can be no doubt as to the territory to which the non-alienation clause refers.

In view of the fact that the matter has been dropped by mutual consent, I agree with orders sent to Turkish Commissioners that they have nothing to do with question of sending troops into the nine cantons.

Although I think mention in *procès-verbal* of fact that Aulaki is one of the nine tribes is superfluous, you can insert it if you think it advisable, as Turkish Commissioners have been told that it is reckoned in the nine cantons.

No. 111.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 10.)

Sir,

India Office, April 7, 1905.

WITH reference to previous correspondence on the subject of the Aden delimitation, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose, for the consideration of the Marquess of Lansdowne, a copy of a telegram from the Government of India indorsing a recommendation of the British Commissioner,* which is supported by the Government of Bombay, that the demarcation proceedings on the Subaihi Boundary should, for the present at least, be confined to the erection of two pillars at Sheikh Said.

Subject to Lord Lansdowne's concurrence, Mr. Brodrick proposes to approve this course.

I am, &c.
(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

No. 112.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 10.)

WITH reference to Mr. Townley's despatch No. 90 of the 7th February last, the Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 16th ultimo, relative to piracies in the neighbourhood of Katif.

India Office, April 8, 1905.

* Inclosure in No. 102.

Inclosure 1 in No. 112.

Captain Trevor to the Government of India.

Bushire, February 26, 1905.

WITH reference to correspondence of the 7th February last, regarding the pirate Ahmed bin Selman, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, an extract from a despatch from His Majesty's Acting Consul at Bussorah on the subject.

Mr. Monahan's Report shows clearly that the local Turkish authorities are making no serious effort to arrest the pirate, and that no effective action on their part can be anticipated.

Inclosure 2 in No. 112.

Acting Consul Monahan to Major Cox.

(Extract.)

Bussorah, February 11, 1905.

WITH reference to your despatch of the 5th ultimo, I have the honour to inform you that the Vali to-day stated that no reply had been received to the last orders sent from the vilayet on the 6th October, 1904, to pursue and capture Ahmed bin Selman and his companions. The Vali further stated that fresh orders to the same effect would now be sent to Hassa.

No. 113.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 11.)

Sir,

India Office, April 11, 1905.

WITH reference to your letters of the 13th and 31st May, 1904, on the subject of the Turkish military posts at Bubiyan Island, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to transmit, for the consideration of the Marquess of Lansdowne, a copy of a letter from the Government of India, inquiring whether, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, the time has not now come for instructing His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople to remind the Porte of previous remonstrances against the maintenance of their military station on the south-east corner of the island, and to press for its withdrawal.

Mr. Brodrick is of opinion that, nearly a year having elapsed since the date of the conversation between Sir N. O'Connor and the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs (reported in his despatch No. 372 of the 16th May, 1904), and no action having apparently been taken by the Turkish Government in the matter, His Majesty's Ambassador might now be instructed, in accordance with the authority conveyed to him in Lord Lansdowne's despatch of the 10th May, 1904, to press for the removal of the post on Bubiyan Island.

It is a matter for consideration whether His Majesty's Ambassador might not further be instructed, in accordance with the suggestion contained in his despatch No. 249 of the 5th April, 1904, to state to the Porte that, unless the Turkish force is withdrawn, His Majesty's Government will be constrained to support the Sheikh of Koweit in establishing a post of his own on the island.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure in No. 113.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

Sir,

Fort William, March 16, 1905.

WE have the honour to refer to our Secret despatch of the 4th February, 1904, and to the subsequent telegraphic correspondence ending with your telegram of the 18th May, 1904, on the subject of the measures that should be taken to obtain the

[1517]

Z

evacuation of Bubiyan Island by the Turkish troops which are at present stationed there.

2. In that despatch we submitted, for your consideration, the following alternative proposals:—

(a.) That the Porte should be informed that we were unable to recognize their right to maintain a station on Bubiyan, and should be requested to withdraw their troops; while, at the same time, we should establish a post on behalf of Sheikh Mubarak on the northern end of the island, opposite to the southern anchorage. We pointed out that he had several boats, and could easily, with small support from us, prevent Turkish troops from crossing the Khor Subbiyeh or channel between Bubiyan and the mainland on the west.

(b.) Should His Majesty's Government deem it advisable to spare the Sultan's susceptibilities by the adoption of a less pronounced course of action, we suggested that our object might be secured by intimating that we regarded Bubiyan Island as belonging to the Sheikh, and that, unless the Turkish force were withdrawn, we should be constrained to support him in establishing a post on the northern shore to balance the Turkish posts at Um Kasr and Al Geit. We observed that, in this case, the Turks would probably retire, and the island would remain unoccupied. The Sheikh would then resume possession, and it would only remain for us to carry out hereafter such further measures as might be necessary for the maintenance of our legitimate interests.

3. Since then, the following action has been taken:—

In April 1904, His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople suggested to the Marquess of Lansdowne that he should first remind the Porte of his previous remonstrances against the maintenance of a Turkish military station on the south-east corner of the island, and press for its withdrawal, and that then if, after a lapse of some months, his representations had produced no effect, the second alternative intimation referred to above should be made to the Turkish Government.

On the 10th May, Sir N. O'Connor was authorized to take action in accordance with his own suggestion, and on the 18th May we were informed that, should the intimation remain for some time without effect, the active measures recommended in our despatch to you of the 4th February would be considered further.

On the 16th May, Sir N. O'Connor reported to Lord Lansdowne the representations which he had made to the Porte. His Excellency carried out his intention of reminding the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the remarks which he had made in 1902 in regard to the establishment of Turkish military posts at Um Kasr and Bubiyan Island, but did not, it appears, avail himself of the authorization which had been given him for making the alternative intimation originally suggested by us, and practically confined himself to saying that he trusted that the Turkish Government would see the propriety of causing the Turkish soldiers to be withdrawn, and would save him from the "unpleasant duty of returning to the subject in a more unpleasant form," as he would be obliged to do unless the matter were arranged within a short time.

4. Since then no further representation appears to have been made to the Porte until the 3rd November, when His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires pointed out that the continued maintenance of the post was looked upon by His Majesty's Government as an infringement of the *status quo*, and that the written protest made by His Majesty's Embassy still remained unanswered. Reference may also be made to the fact that, on the 30th December, you informed Lord Ampthill that His Majesty's Government were unable to accept his suggestion that the removal of the Political Agent at Koweit should be made conditional on the removal of the Turkish post on Bubiyan Island.

5. Nothing has, however, happened since the date of their original recommendation to induce the Government of India to depart from their contention as to the importance of obtaining by some means the removal of the Turkish troops.

6. In our previous despatch on the subject we have already furnished you with a full statement of the reasons which have led us to adopt this view; and we need not now do more than point out that the Turkish troops meanwhile remain in the island; that it is evident that the remonstrances made have not been treated with sufficient seriousness by the Turkish Government, who, with the continued postponement of the withdrawal of their troops, are in some degree increasing their presumptive right of dominion over Bubiyan in the eyes of the world in general; and that consequently every additional day of inaction will render it more difficult for His Majesty's Government to insist ultimately on evacuation.

7. In these circumstances, we have the honour to inquire whether His Majesty's Government do not consider that the time has now come when His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople might with advantage be provided with definite instructions to make

to the Porte the intimation which was authorized in May 1904, and also whether they will not agree to take into their immediate consideration the advisability of adopting the alternative local measures recommended by us in February 1904, which we still consider to be of urgent importance for the proper protection of British interests in the Persian Gulf.

We have, &c.
(Signed) CURZON.
KITCHENER.
E. R. ELLES.
A. T. ARUNDEL.
DENZIL IBBETSON.
H. ERLE RICHARDS.
J. P. HEWETT.
E. N. BAKER.

No. 114.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 114.)
Sir,

Foreign Office, April 11, 1905.

I HAVE received your Excellency's despatch No. 200, Confidential, of the 29th ultimo, at the end of which you report that you have been informed that eight Turkish soldiers and a sergeant still remain on Bubiyan Island.

Your Excellency does not state whether you are taking any action in the matter, but, in view of the length of time which has elapsed since you last addressed the Turkish Government on the subject, it seems a question for consideration whether, as proposed in your despatch No. 249 of the 5th instant, the Porte should now be informed that, unless the Turkish force is withdrawn, we shall be constrained to support the Sheikh of Koweit in establishing a post on the island.

The Government of India are of opinion that the Sheikh will feel considerable dissatisfaction at the temporary withdrawal of Captain Knox from Koweit, which will shortly take place, and there is thus an additional reason for endeavouring to obtain a satisfactory solution of the question which has arisen at Bubiyan.

I should wish to learn whether your Excellency considers that the moment is opportune for a representation in the sense I have indicated, or whether you think that further delay is desirable.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 115.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 12.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 2nd March, relative to quarantine arrangements in the Persian Gulf.

India Office, April 11, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 115.

Government of India to Major Cox.

Sir,

Fort William, February 28, 1905.

I AM directed to suggest that you should make inquiries of His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah as to what foundation there is for the statement of the Koweit Nakhodas, referred to in your letter dated the 4th instant, on the subject of the alleged discrimination shown by the Turkish quarantine authorities at Bussorah against Koweit ships.

I have, &c.
(Signed) C. SOMERS COCKS.

Inclosure 2 in No. 115.

*Major Cox to Government of India.**Bushire, February 4, 1905.*

WITH reference to paragraph 4 of my letter, dated the 14th January, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copy of a letter, dated the 16th January, with inclosure, which I have received from Captain S. G. Knox, Political Agent, Koweit, on the subject.

Inclosure 3 in No. 115.

*Captain Knox to Major Cox.**January 16, 1905.*

IN reply to your letter, dated the 5th January last, in which I am directed to report on Turkish quarantine arrangements as affecting subjects of Koweit, I have the honour to forward herewith the translation of notes made by my vernacular Munshi at the examination of certain Nakhodas by Moolla Abdulla, the Sheikh's Secretary.

2. I consider it better not to appear myself at the inquiry which the Sheikh ordered at my request, but I doubt in any case whether more satisfactory results could have been obtained.

3. Turkish Quarantine Regulations are notoriously easy to evade, and it is probable that recently special directions have been made to see that they apply strictly to Koweit vessels.

Inclosure 4 in No. 115.

Description of the Methods of Quarantine at Bussorah against Natives of Koweit.

ON their arrival at Bussorah, they wait in their boats five days in quarantine; and after the five days' period they are put on shore and washed and fumigated, and 10 mejidis are paid as fees when they are released; and on their departure to their countries the same performance is gone through, and a fee of 1 mejidi is paid for each boat.

The people of Bahrein and Katr are treated in the same way. The fees paid are less than those of Koweit.

As for Persian subjects, they are quarantined for twenty-four hours only, and they pay a fee of 2 mejidis.

The Nakhodas from whom this information was obtained say that when the Koweit people complained at having to pay higher fees than others, the quarantine officials admitted the injustice, but said that it was also unjust of Mubarak to admit the English to Koweit.

No. 116.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 12.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 18th March, relative to Nejd affairs.

India Office, April 11, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 116.

*Extracts from the Diaries of the Persian Gulf Political Residency for the week ending February 5, 1905.**Koweit.*

5. *January 24.*—It is reported that Ibn Saud has arrived at Subaiheya in connection with the anticipated meeting with the Vali of Bussorah at Sefwan, where Sheikh Mubarek is to join them. Sheikh Mubarek is, apparently, very nervous about this meeting.

Yusef-el-Ibrahim is reported to have returned to Nejj, and is busy buying camels, &c., for Ibn Rashid.

Bahrein.

14. *January 24.*—Abdul Hussein-bin-Jima, brother of Haji Mansur, late Acting Kaïmakam of Katif, who has arrived from Katif, states that orders have been received in Katif and El Hasa from the Turkish Government, calling upon the people of these districts to contribute money sufficient for the purchase of 200 and 300 camels respectively. The Katif people have replied, through the Kaïmakam, that they cannot afford to subscribe the money demanded.

*Extracts from the Diaries of the Persian Gulf Political Residency for the weeks ending respectively February 12, 19, and 26, 1905.**Bushire.*

16. *February 7.*—In a telegram dispatched by the "Ruler of Koweit and Chief of the Tribes, Mubarek," to the Vali of Bussorah, Sheikh Mubarek stated that he had received the orders sent with the Vali's messenger; that Abdul Rahman-bin-Feisal had arrived at a spot eleven hours' distance from Jehara, where he had been stopped three days on account of the cold, but would, please God, arrive on the 4th February at Jehara, when he (Mubarek) would inform the Vali of his arrival. He added that Abdul Rahman would confirm Mubarek's statements as to his (Abdul Rahman's) loyalty to the Sultan (see entry No. 5 in Diary for last week).

Koweit.

2. *January 31.*—Sheikh Mubarek, Chief of Koweit, left for Jahra en route to Sefwan, for the proposed Conference.

4. *February 5.*—Reports have reached Koweit that Bin Saud and Sheikh Mubarek have left Jahra for Sefwan with about 1,000 cavalry, camels, and men.

Koweit.

5. *February 15.*—Reports have reached Koweit that the Turkish Government have appointed Ibn Saud the Chief for the whole of Nejd, but to be solely guided by Sheikh Mubarek. They have given him honours and decorations. The Turkish Government will post their soldiers at Boreida, Kaseem, and Riadh. The three prisoners (*vide* entry No. 3 in Diary for week ending the 5th February) who are at present in Bagdad will be released. It is also said that Ibn Rashid and his people will now vacate Zobair and Bussorah.

Later information received by the Political Agent through Sheikh Jabir-bin-Mubarek is to the following effect:—Sheikh Mubarek writes: "His Excellency the Vali of Bussorah came last Wednesday (the 8th February) to see us. I told him I have nothing to do with affairs in Nejd. This is Ibn Saud, and you can settle matters with him. There was a long conference, and late in the afternoon his Excellency

returned to Bussorah. On Monday night, at 9 p.m. he came back to our camp and brought an order from Constantinople, addressed to Ibn Saud, appointing him Ruler of Nejd on behalf of the Turkish Government, and concluding with the following words: 'The Government will put soldiers in El Kasim, and there will be official relations between you (i.e., Ibn Saud) and them, and all of you will be in the service of the Sultan. As for Ibn Rashid, he shall have nothing to do with affairs in Nejd.'

Bushire.

12. February 17.—News has been received that the Mushir (Commander-in-chief) of Bagdad has gone to the interior of Nejd with Turkish soldiers.

No. 117.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 12.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 16th ultimo, relative to a piratical attack on Bahrein boats by members of the Behaih section of the Marrah tribe.

India Office, April 12, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 117.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

Bushire, February 26, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of a letter which I have received from the Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein, regarding a piratical attack made on two Bahrein boats by some members of the Behaih section of the Marrah tribe.

2. Captain Prideaux is probably not wrong in the inference he has drawn of Sheikh Isa's attitude, and the matter will no doubt be discussed by him with the Resident, who is in Bahrein at present.

Inclosure 2 in No. 117.

Captain Prideaux to Major Cox.

Bahrein, February 17, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inclose a copy of a statement made by two Arab subjects of the Chief of Bahrein and recorded by my Munshi Haji Abbas, relative to a piratical act recently committed by some thirty-five Bedouins of the Marrah Behaih tribe on two Bahrein boats' crews, in which a slave boy belonging to the Bahreinis was carried off as a prize, and two of the boatmen were dangerously wounded.

2. The two sufferers are now under the treatment of Dr. Thoms, of the Arabian Mission, through whom I first heard of the affair. I am informed that, when the other boatmen laid their complaint before Sheikh Isa, they were most unfavourably received, and I have had no communication on the subject from the Chief, which surprises me considerably.

It seems possible that the Chief's peculiar reception of the news and his subsequent reticence is due to the fact that he has hitherto failed to obtain any satisfaction in the earlier and more important affair of his cousin's murder by the same tribe.

3. I have communicated the facts of the recent case to His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah, with a view to the Turkish authorities being moved to take suitable action, but I do not suppose that any satisfaction will be forthcoming until I have been provided with the steam-launch which I understand has been for some time under the consideration of the Government of India.

Inclosure 3 in No. 117.

Statement of Sultan-bin-Sayf-bin-Thakhayel and Mahomed-bin-Abdullah-bin-Thakhayel.

WE, with seven others in one "mashuwa" and another "mashuwa" with eight men, including a Sidi, slave of Ali-bin-Isa-bin-Thaluch, sailed from Hudd on the 28th Thilcada, 1322 (the 3rd February, 1905), and landed at Ras-Abu Huekil, on the coast of Hasa, south of Ojair.

There we commenced collecting firewood. All of a sudden we were attacked by Bedouins of the tribe of Marrah-al-Behaih. We ran away from them, and tried to get back to our boats.

The Bedouins hotly pursued us, firing at us at the same time, and at last succeeded in catching the Sidi boy, whom they carried off.

While we were raising the anchors of our boats, we two cousins, Sultan and Mahomed, received two bullet wounds each. Sultan, one bullet passing through the left leg, and the other through the right leg and penis; Mahomed, one bullet on the penis, which was divided into two, and the other in the right hand, both bullets passing through.

No. 118.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 12.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 16th ultimo, relative to the Persian Gulf Gazetteer tour.

India Office, April 12, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 118.

Mr. Lorimer to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Muscat, February 28, 1905.

LEAVE Muscat to-day in "Lawrence" for Pirate Coast and Bahrein. Mahot trip is abandoned.

Inclosure 2 in No. 118.

Mr. Lorimer to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, March 12, 1905.

HAVE left Bahrein for India.

Inclosure 3 in No. 118.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

Bushire, February 25, 1905.

IN continuation of the correspondence ending with my telegram dated the 21st instant on the subject of complaints made by the Turkish Government, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of the marginally noted letter from Captain S. G. Knox on the subject, and to submit a report in detail.

2. Mr. Lorimer gives the following explanation as far as the complaints relate to the movements of the Gazetteer party: No visit to Nejd by any members of the Gazetteer party was ever contemplated. The visit to Nejd has been abandoned, and the Gazetteer party after proceeding to Karbala returned to Bagdad via Hilla, and

have now finally left Turkish Arabia. Mr. Lorimer has abandoned his idea of a visit to El Hassa, and will keep you informed as far as possible of changes in his programme.

3. The complaint about "the British functionary" with "five vessels" can only refer to the proceedings of the Officer in charge of the Marine Survey when surveying Koweit Harbour, and as the "Investigator" is shortly to recommence operations, no doubt some more sensational reports may be anticipated.

Inclosure 4 in No 118.

Captain Knox to Major Cox.

February 11, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated the 31st ultimo, calling for an early report regarding the Turkish Ambassador's complaints contained in Foreign Office telegram No. 400-E.B.

2. I can only conclude that the first portion of the first complaint refers to the survey measures taken by the commander of Royal Indian Mail steamer "Investigator," while the latter portion probably refers to Mr. Gabriel's visit to Um-Kasr. The British functionary may be myself, and it is hardly necessary to say that no attempt was made by me to incite Arab tribes to submit to Mubarak. I doubt if I spoke to or met with twenty persons outside my camp following between Subiya and my return to Jahra, as I carefully avoided all communication with the natives at either Um-Kasr or Sefwan, and the rest of the country was uninhabited.

3. As regards the second complaint, I have never heard of nor seen the British flag hoisted on Sheikh Mubarak's residence. The reference may be to the hoisting of a flag by the officers of Royal Indian Mail steamer "Investigator" on the Sheikh's residence at Sirrah, a conspicuous and convenient point for survey operations. The flag was a large blue and white one, and the fact of its being hoisted had no political significance.

No. 119.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 12.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 16th March, relative to the case of a Koweit subject accused of wounding a Persian negro, and the disposal of a Koweit dhow wrecked on Hormuz Island.

India Office, April 12, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 119.

Extracts from the Persian Gulf Political Residency Diaries for the Weeks ending respectively February 5 and 19, 1905.

Bushire.

25. February 2, 1905.—The case in which Khaled-bin-Khamis, a Koweit subject, and pilot in the service of the British India Steam Navigation Company, was accused in June last of having wounded with a knife Ghulam Ali, a Persian negro, has been settled by payment of a fine of 200 rupees.

The case was tried by the Karguzar (Persian Foreign Office Agent), Bushire, in the presence of a representative from this Residency, and the Karguzar's decision was communicated to the Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs, who authorized him to settle it as he proposed. The Turkish Vice-Consul tried to intervene early in the case on the alleged ground that Khaled, being a Koweit, was a Turkish subject, but his pretensions were not allowed.

Bunder Abbas.

8. February 7.—His Majesty's Consul and Assistant Resident visited Hormuz, Larak, Henjam, and returned to Bunder Abbas to-day.

At Hormuz the Kalantar, or Persian Governor of the island, called upon Lieutenant Shakespear and consulted him with regard to the disposal of the relics of a Koweit dhow and cargo which had recently been wrecked on the island, and saved by the Kalantar's men. The owner and Nakhoda were Koweit and Muscat subjects respectively, and, out of a crew of seventeen, eight men had been drowned. The Deputy Governor of Bunder Abbas had sent a message to the Kalantar directing him on no account to permit the Customs authorities to remove the salvaged property.

Contrary messages came from the Customs Director, and subsequently a number of tufangchis arrived and had evidently been instructed to remove the goods by force.

His Majesty's Consul accordingly refrained from any intervention, but informed those concerned that, in the event of any complaint being received from Koweit or Muscat subjects in regard to the salvaged goods now to be removed, the Customs Department would be held responsible.

In the evening Lieutenant Shakespear left for Larak Island.

No. 120.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 40.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, April 12, 1905.

DO you see any objection to the erection of two pillars at Sheikh Saïd only, as suggested by Mr. Fitzmaurice, who thinks it unnecessary to put demarcation pillars along the greater portion of the Subaihi boundary line, which follows well-defined natural features?

The Government of India and the India Office agree to this suggestion, as the work can be done without escort, and expense and risk of illness in consequence of the hot weather will be avoided.

No. 121.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 13.)

(No. 66.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, April 13, 1905.

I SEE no objection to the proposal relative to the Subaihi boundary contained in your Lordship's telegram No. 40 of yesterday.

No. 122.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to M. Cambon.

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, April 13, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th ultimo on the question of the introduction of the name of the Sultan of Muscat in the British Case, as one of the Parties in the Muscat Dhow Arbitration.

Your Excellency states that the French Government take note of the promise made by me that, in the further documents to be presented by His Majesty's Government to the Tribunal, the name of His Highness will not appear as one of the Parties to the Arbitration. It is not necessary, therefore, to enter into further argument as to the grounds on which His Majesty's Government originally thought it right to insert His Highness' name.

But as your Excellency has referred to what passed between us on the 25th May, 1903, in regard to the Agreement for referring the question at issue to arbitration, I think it right to observe that the passage which, at your request, was omitted from the draft of my note on the subject, provided for the reference to arbitration of any questions which the Sultan might desire to raise. It is the fact, as your Excellency

[1517]

2 P

states, that you objected on behalf of the French Government to accepting any demands for arbitration which the Sultan might himself put forward.

But I did not, at the time, understand you to state that your Government wished to preclude the Tribunal from taking cognizance of the Sultan's views upon any questions affecting his interests which the British or French Government might desire to refer to it for settlement.

His Majesty's Government will communicate your Excellency's note, with this reply, to the Tribunal, in the same manner as the previous correspondence.

I have, &c.
(Signed) LANSLOWNE.

No. 123.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, April 13, 1905.*
THE Marquess of Lansdowne has had under his consideration, in communication with His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, your letter of the 7th instant respecting the recommendation made by the British member on the Aden Boundary Commission, that the demarcation proceedings on the Subaihi boundary should, for the present at least, be confined to the erection of two pillars at Sheikh Said.

I am directed by his Lordship to state that he concurs in Mr. Secretary Brodrick's proposal to approve the course suggested by Mr. Fitzmaurice.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 124.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, April 15, 1905.*
I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you herewith, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople,* reporting that Mr. Fitzmaurice had raised two new points in connection with the Aden boundary delimitation, upon which, however, it appeared to his Excellency unnecessary to insist, and that he had telegraphed to Mr. Fitzmaurice accordingly.

Lord Lansdowne proposes, if Mr. Brodrick concurs, to approve the action taken by Sir N. O'Connor in the matter.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GORST.

No. 125.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 16.)

(No. 70.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Constantinople, April 16, 1905.*
WITH reference to my telegrams, Nos. 64 and 66, of the 4th and 13th instant, on the subject of the Aden frontier.

Fitzmaurice has been waiting some days for instructions and further delay is very undesirable. May I instruct him to sign *procès-verbal* and map, and does your Lordship authorize the acceptance of arrangement respecting the two pillars on the Subaihi frontier and respecting Jubau in the north-east?

No. 126.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 17.)

(No. 226.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, April 8, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a despatch from Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell, Military Attaché to His Majesty's Embassy, reporting on the mobilization of the St. Jean d'Acre Brigade for service in the Yemen.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 126.

Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 10.)

Sir,

Beyrout, March 24, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Akka (St. Jean d'Acre) Redif Brigade is being mobilized in accordance with orders given, as reported in a previous despatch.

Great difficulty is being experienced in getting the men to go on service in the Yemen, as they sell their land or their possessions to try and buy themselves off, or they desert; so that yesterday an urgent telegram was received from Constantinople to hasten the mobilization, mentioning that it was of the utmost importance to the "integrity of the Empire."

Equipment is almost entirely wanting; the men go in ordinary clothing to the sea-ports, and receive their Mauser rifles and clothing at Hodeida, whither they have been sent from Constantinople.

The Akaba route has had to be abandoned for these troops owing to the difficulty of provisioning the men, and they are going through the Canal in the ordinary way.

A transport with time-expired men arrived here a few days ago from the Hejaz, and the men spent the day at the Government Konak, vainly endeavouring to obtain arrears of pay which they had been promised on arrival at Beyrout. When visiting the Vali my conversation was interrupted by the half-angry, half-despairing shouts of some 300 of these men ranged round the courtyard below.

Officials hurried in with whispered messages, but the Vali waived them aside, saying the Treasury was empty, and smilingly continued his conversation.

The men were still patiently sitting round the courtyard when I passed in the evening.

There is no doubt that a serious Turkish defeat in the Yemen would react most unfavourably on the discontented elements of the population in Syria.

It is, perhaps, important to note that the troops employed in the suppression of this insurrection in the Yemen are almost entirely men of Syrian race drawn from these districts, and that very few of the Osmanli or dominant race are employed for service there.

Men from Syria have no desire to quarrel with Arabs of the Yemen, and are, if anything, sympathetic towards them, whom they look upon as belonging to the same race; so that this constant drain of men to prosecute an arduous campaign from which few survive to return, and in which no glory is to be gained, is not without a sinister effect in this country.

The men are patient and submissive to an extraordinary degree, but the discontent caused by the expedition has already begun to make the turbulent or discontented elements in the country speak out much more boldly than usual, so that, in the event of further Turkish defeats, coupled with the withdrawal of so many regular troops from the country, this may have a most disturbing effect.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. R. MAUNSELL, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Military Attaché.

No. 127.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 17.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 15th April, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, April 17, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 127.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

April 15, 1905.

ADEN delimitation. Your telegram of the 5th April.

We are of opinion that His Majesty's Government might accept the compromise whereby Rubeaten, Nawa, and Dhabiani remain with us, while Juban is ceded to the Turks. Further, as regards boundary north-east, we consider demarcation is unnecessary. It will, we assume, be made clear that the line which is accepted as the basis of boundary to the north-east is one running true north-east from the pillar last erected. If this assumption is correct, we agree that inclusion in proceedings of statement that Aulaki are British need not be insisted upon, provided that in some other way the fact is put on record officially.

No. 128.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 17.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 15th April, relative to the Muscat Arbitration.

India Office, April 17, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 128.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

April 15, 1905.

MUSCAT Arbitration. Please see the letter, dated the 21st March, from Major Cox to the Government of India. We have nothing to add to the points which are dealt with in the separate note by Cox. We consider that in the British Counter-Case particular stress should be laid on the following points:—

1. The inclusion in the list of French protégés of three deceased men, as showing how untrustworthy the French data are.
2. The denial of the sovereignty of the Sultan, as implied in the refusal of French protégés at Soor to discuss their status with His Highness, an attitude in which they apparently had the countenance of the French Consul.

3. The evasion of customs, as shown by the small amount of food manifested at Bombay for Soor, as contrasted with the large amount manifested for Maseera. Our local officers have been instructed to communicate to you direct by telegraph any instances, which may be specially proved, of evasion of customs due to the use of French flag and resulting in loss of revenue to the Sultan.

See also the letter from the Sultan of the 21st March as to the protégés in the list. We consider a strong effort should be made to obtain from the French the details requested by His Highness.

As regards the remarks of Major Cox concerning Oman, these should not be taken as superseding Lorimer's map and notes.

(Repeated to Major Cox and Captain Grey.)

No. 129.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 46.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, April 17, 1905.

THE Government of India have telegraphed as follows on the subject of the Aden delimitation, referred to in your telegram No. 70 of yesterday:—

[Repeats Viceroy's telegram of April 15, in India Office, April 17, 1905.]

His Majesty's Government accept the arrangements as to Juban and the two pillars on the Subaihi frontier. You may inform Mr. Fitzmaurice, and send him instructions to sign the compromise.

No. 130.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 18.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of telegrams to the Viceroy, dated the 4th and 5th instant, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, April 17, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 130.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, April 4, 1905.

ADEN boundary. Your telegram of the 27th ultimo.

A written communication, dated the 1st instant, has been procured from the Porte by His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, in which it is definitely stated that the area of 550 square miles referred to in Sir N. O'Connor's Memorandum of the 11th August, 1904, is covered by the Turkish non-alienation undertaking.

Inclosure 2 in No. 130.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, April 5, 1905.

ADEN boundary. Please let me have your views on the suggestion made in Fitzmaurice's telegram No. 11 of the 4th instant regarding Yaffai sub-districts. His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople thinks that possibly the proposed compromise may be to our advantage.

(Repeated to Aden.)

No. 131.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 18.)

Sir,

India Office, April 18, 1905.

WITH reference to your letters of the 5th and 17th instant, transmitting copies of Sir N. O'Connor's telegrams Nos. 64 of the 4th instant and No. 70 of the 16th instant, relative to the boundary of the Aden Protectorate, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose, for the information of the Marquess of Lansdowne, a copy of a telegram from the Viceroy,* dated the 15th April, expressing concurrence in the

* See Inclosure in No. 127.

arrangement respecting Juban proposed in Mr. Fitzmaurice's telegram No. 11 of the 4th April.

I am also to inclose a copy of a telegram which Mr. Brodrick addressed to the Viceroy on the 17th instant respecting the Subaihi frontier.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

inclosure in No. 131.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Secret.)
(Telegraphic.)

India Office, April 17, 1905.

YOURS 4th instant. Subaihi boundary.

His Majesty's Government concur in proposal that present operations should be limited to erecting couple of pillars necessary at Sheikh Said.

(Repeated to Aden.)

No. 132.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 19.)

(No. 241.)
My Lord,

Constantinople, April 15, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 189 of the 26th ultimo, and to my telegram No. 60 of the 1st instant, I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship figures of telegrams from His Majesty's Consular officers at Jeddah and Hodeida, dated, respectively, the 13th and 14th instant.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure 1 in No. 132.

Consul Devey to Sir N. O'Connor.

(Telegraphic.)

Jeddah, April 13, 1905.

CONTRARY to my telegram of the 25th March, but according to letter of the 6th April, Sanaa appeared about to surrender to the Imam.

Izzet and Rizza Pashas were surrounded and helpless near city.

Inclosure 2 in No. 132.

Vice-Consul Richardson to Sir N. O'Connor.

(Telegraphic.)

Hodeida, April 14, 1905.

MY telegram of the 30th March: information therein premature. Rizza Pasha reached Sanaa with 600 troops, only after severe fights, 30th March. Remainder of his force deserting him. Insurgents captured cannon, provisions, transport, rifles, quantity of ammunition; all garrisons on line of communication surrounded. Position of capital precarious, and general situation grave; 32nd battalion of Albanian Turkish troops expected; 1,000 Albanians arrived the 13th April.

No. 133.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 19.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of the correspondence relative to the revised Treaty with the Amir of Dthala.

India Office, April 18, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 133.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Secret.)
Sir,

Fort William, March 9, 1905.

WITH reference to your Secret despatch, dated the 23rd September, 1904, relative to the conclusion of a revised Treaty with the Amir of Dthala, we have the honour to forward herewith copies of the Treaty, which has been ratified by the Viceroy and Governor-General in Council, together with copies of the papers.

We have, &c.

(Signed) CURZON.
KITCHENER.
E. R. ELLES.
A. T. ARUNDEL.
DENZIL IBBETSON.
H. ERLE RICHARDS.
J. P. HEWETT.
E. N. BAKER.

Inclosure 2 in No. 133.

Government of Bombay to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Bombay Castle, November 29, 1904.

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with Mr. Somers Cocks' Confidential letter, dated the 17th October, 1904, I am directed to forward herewith, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of correspondence regarding the revised Treaty with the Amir of Dthala.

Inclosure 3 in No. 133.

Major-General Mason to Government of Bombay.

(Confidential.)
(Memo.)

Aden Residency, November 5, 1904.

HAS the honour to state that he considers it necessary to forward the following letter as it contains the views of the Political Officer, Dthala. Although he does not share the pessimistic views regarding the feelings of the tribes towards the British, still he is of opinion that Major Merewether's recommendation regarding stipends is sound.

There is no doubt that the Amir of Dthala, owing to his unjust treatment and oppression of his subjects, has incurred their hatred. The Amir is now in Aden, and the Undersigned is to have an interview with him on the 7th instant, when he will speak to him on this matter, and will also take the opportunity of impressing upon him the necessity of adhering to the Treaty in every particular. The Undersigned does not, however, propose to ask the Amir to sign the new Treaty until Government have perused the letter now forwarded and have passed their orders upon it.

Inclosure 4 in No. 133.

Major Merewether to Lieutenant-Colonel Davies.

(Confidential.)

Dthala, October 29, 1904.

WITH reference to copy of letter, dated Simla, the 22nd September, 1904, from the Under-Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, forwarded with your indorsement of the 10th October, 1904, I have the honour to offer the following remarks for the consideration of the Resident:—

2. In paragraph 2 of the letter the following sentence occurs, "the wisdom of the direct grant of stipends to a tribe such as the Kotaibi, who are dependents of the Amir of Dthala, seems, moreover, to be exceedingly doubtful."

It is true that the Kotaibis are nominally dependents of the Amir of Dthala.

They do not, however, acknowledge his suzerainty, and were it not for the presence of our troops in the Amir's country, they would undoubtedly take active steps to prove their independence, steps which I have little doubt would prove successful.

I will now give a brief description of the present position of the Amir of Dthala and of the Kotaibi. The Amir has never occupied so strong a position as he does at the present moment. This, however, is solely due to the presence of British troops.

His avarice, treachery, and cruelty have made his name a by-word amongst even the Arabs, with whom such attributes are common. He has estranged the sympathies of practically all the tribes under his rule. Were we to withdraw, I fully believe that the Amir would have to leave his country and would be lucky if he got out alive.

The only alternative he would possess would be:—

- (1.) To intrigue with the Turks.
- (2.) To grant all the demands of the Kotaibis as to the levying of dues on the Haberlain and to renounce his suzerainty over them.
- (3.) To hire fighting men to assist him in retaining his position. His own tribes would certainly not assist him without pay, and I doubt whether they would do so even if paid.
- (4.) To ask our assistance.

The Amir would certainly, in the first instance, ask for our assistance.

He would grant all demands of Kotaibis, for the simple reason that he is perfectly aware of his absolute inability to enforce his prohibition of their collection of dues on the Haberlain or to render his suzerainty a reality instead of a name. He would probably try to strengthen his position by intrigues with the Turks.

I very much doubt whether, in the event of failure in all these directions, he would attempt to fight the matter out. He himself has more than once told me that, in the event of our withdrawing from Dthala, he would at once make for Aden. In any case, his exchequer once exhausted, he would have to leave the country.

He is so universally detested by the Arabs that there is no doubt that we have lost considerable prestige by our attempts to bolster him up, and, moreover, to attempt to do so at the expense of the Kotaibis was a fatal error, having regard to the position occupied by the Kotaibis with reference to the Lower Yaffai as well as the other Radfan tribes. I can only ascribe our having done so to the fact that the country was comparatively new to us, and that accurate local knowledge was therefore difficult to obtain.

3. I would point out, with reference to the additional grant of 100 dollars per mensem, proposed in the new Treaty which is shortly to be entered into with the Amir, that, relying on our presence, he has not kept up any troops whatever. He has merely a few Arabs armed with rifles, numbering about fifteen. Had we not been here he would have had to maintain a force to protect his own territory without any pecuniary assistance from us.

If this be contrasted with the numbers maintained by the Sultans of Lahej and Mokalla, it will be seen that the Amir has taken advantage of our presence to save money, and that since our arrival in the country he has never been in a position to fulfil his Treaty obligations. By this I mean that he is bound to preserve order in his territory and to assure the safety of the trade routes. If, however, he were called on suddenly to send a sufficient force at once to maintain order on the route from Dthala to Sulek, which has been the most frequent scene of outrages, and which is entirely within his territory, he would be absolutely unable to do so.

Further, I have ascertained that the Amir has not even sufficient authority in the actual valley of Dthala to enforce his orders, and that in order to do so, he has to threaten the people that he will get us to come and attack them if they fail to obey his orders.

He has, moreover, as I have reported, deliberately broken his agreement as to the dues to be levied on goods, &c., imported from Aden to Dthala or *vice versa*, not only once but twice, having practically from the date on which he signed the Agreement, i.e., 1888, never had the least intention of adhering to it. I have had the very greatest difficulty in inducing him to return to the scale to which he had agreed, and I have not the least doubt that he will take the very first available opportunity of

again raising the scale of dues. In some cases I may mention that he was charging ten times the amount sanctioned by the 1888 Agreement.

Further, it is a matter of common knowledge that the Amir has exerted himself to the utmost to prevent any reconciliation between the Kotaibis and ourselves. His object has been to stir up the Kotaibis to outrages on the trade routes with a view to their being utterly crushed by us before we leave this country.

Finding, however, that his intrigues were of no avail, and that I was on the point of receiving the submission of Mahomed Saleh, he sent his eldest son, Naser, secretly to a place on the borders of the Kotaibi country, with a view to an interview with Mahomed Saleh. The sole object of this was undoubtedly to forestall me and to make peace, probably on the lines of a general renunciation of all suzerain rights.

Luckily Mahomed Saleh, being already in close communication with me, refused to meet Sheikh Naser.

I have mentioned this incident, and have gone into the whole question at considerable length, as I know it to be one of considerable importance to our future in the Hinterland, and also with a view to illustrating the different degrees of reliance to be placed on the good faith of the Amir and of Mahomed Saleh respectively.

4. As regards the position occupied by the Kotaibis amongst the tribes of the Hinterland on account of their territorial extent or numerical strength, I may say at once that it is comparatively insignificant. The points, however, on which, in my opinion, sufficient stress has not been laid are, (a) what influence have the Kotaibis in Lower Yaffai, and (b) amongst the other Radfan tribes.

With regard to (a) it will be remembered that the Kotaibis were originally Lower Yaffai. The tribes to the present day between the Kotaibis and the Lower Yaffai are very strong and closely drawn. The Kotaibi Sheikh, Mahomed Saleh, in addition to tribal ties, is a close personal friend of Abdalla bin Mohsin, the Lower Yaffai Sultan.

In July last I had good reason to believe that the Kotaibis, assisted by other Radfan tribes, intended to again attack the post at Sulek. At the same time I received reliable information that a force of between 15,000 and 17,000 men was being collected round Al Khara, the head-quarters of the Lower Yaffai Sultan.

The object undoubtedly was a simultaneous attack on Dthala and Sulek.

This joint movement I ascertained to have been due to reports spread by intrigues of our intention of attacking the Kotaibis. I found that constant communications had been passing between Mahomed Saleh and Abdalla bin Mohsin.

Since matters have come to a more satisfactory state between us, there has been little correspondence between these two Chiefs.

It is not necessary for me to remark on the serious position in which we should have found ourselves had this simultaneous attack taken place.

The salient point is that a British force of about 1,200 men, many invalids, with only two camel-battery guns, with an insufficient supply of food and ammunition, 100 miles from any further supply of reinforcements, would have found itself opposed to a body of Arabs numbering possibly 25,000, and mostly armed with French rifles. The reinforcements available at Aden would have been insufficient to effect a diversion, even had they succeeded in forcing the two passes on the road.

The prime mover in this was Sheikh Mahomed Saleh, the Kotaibi, and I have quoted this instance to show to what extent his friendliness or otherwise to us may affect any future delimitation of the north-east boundary, which must pass through both Upper and Lower Yaffai.

I considered the matter to be urgent, and, after receiving permission to do so, I invited Mahomed Saleh to meet me at Sulek. He declined to do so, and eventually I had to meet him in his own country. I gathered enough at that meeting to confirm my belief that the information as to the intended attack on us was founded on fact, and that, had not reinforcements and guns been sent up country, and the tribes not thus learnt that we were ready for them, the attack might actually have taken place.

With reference to the Radfan tribes, it is true that the Chiefs all assured me that whatever happened they would not join any one against us. The Alawi and Hijaili were possibly sincere in this statement. Had hostilities actually broken out it is more than possible, however, that the Sheikhs of these two tribes would have been unable to restrain their tribesmen. The Abdullah, the Sairi, the Bukri, and the Dthambari would assuredly have gone against us, and, taking advantage of the general confusion that would have ensued, the Subaihis and Haushabis would probably have joined in.

As a result of Mahomed Saleh's hostility, it was therefore perfectly possible, even probable, that we should have had against us the following tribes:—

Upper and Lower Yaffais, although apparently separate, they join together against an external enemy.

The Kotaibis, Dthambaris, Abdulleh, Dairi, Bukri, probably the Hijailis, and the Alawis, the Subaihis, and the Haushabis; and it remained to be seen which side the Amir's subjects would take.

5. Since my arrival in Dthala, I have given a great deal of attention to this Yaffai-Kotaibi question, realizing as I did that, as far as our relations with the tribes went, it was the most important point of all.

I found Mahomed Saleh in a state of sullen defiance. At first he utterly declined to meet me, giving as his reason for declining that he never would see another British officer of his own free will.

He eventually met me in his own country, and a short time ago wrote to say that, if I guaranteed his safety, he would come into our post at Sulek and meet me there. I gave him the required guarantee, and went to Sulek to meet him. On arrival I found that Mahomed Saleh was seriously ill. I ascertained this to be genuine. I consulted the doctor, and sent him a letter giving him medical advice. He has now recovered, and appears to be intensely grateful. He has asked me to meet him after Ramadhan at Sulek.

6. I trust I have shown sufficient grounds for my belief that:—

(1.) The Kotaibis are not really dependents of the Amir at all.

(2.) That any arrangements we make in the direction of friendly relations with them will ultimately greatly benefit the Amir of Dthala.

(3.) That, even supposing the Kotaibis to be dependents of the Amir, we commit no breach of faith with him in making an arrangement by which the safety of his principal trade route, which he is by Treaty bound to protect, but which he has utterly failed to do, will be, as far as can be anticipated, assured.

(4.) That the Amir's own attitude towards his Treaty and Agreements with us has been such as to forfeit all claim to consideration in a matter the result of which can only be to benefit all parties concerned.

(5.) That the Kotaibi Sheikh is a factor to be very seriously considered, it being remembered that the Yaffai have it indelibly fixed in their minds that sooner or later we mean to invade their country.

(6.) That for the first time since the punitive expedition against the Kotaibis, Mahomed Saleh is willing and anxious to treat.

7. I cannot help thinking that we have made two great mistakes in this part of the country, mistakes which, unless rectified at a very early date, are likely to cause us very great trouble and expense.

(a.) We forced the Amir of Dthala on the Kotaibis. Left to himself, much as he might have desired to do so, he would never have been rash enough to attempt to actively assert and exercise his suzerainty.

The Kotaibis were the very last people with whom we ought to have interfered in this manner, influential as their Sheikh is with the Yaffai, and situated as they are in a commanding position on the main route between Aden and Dthala on our lines of communication.

The Kotaibis will never acknowledge the suzerainty of the Amir of Dthala. They know him too well.

Unfortunately, what we have done we cannot undo, or it would encourage other tribes to break out in order to get us to redress their grievances.

The point can, however, with care be glossed over.

(b.) We deprive the Kotaibis of the dues which had been levied by them on the Haberland before our arrival and gave them nothing in return.

With reference to my belief that the Amir was at the bottom of the Kotaibi rising, I have just come across a letter from Major Pullen, Royal Garrison Artillery, dated Nobat Dakim, the 28th September, 1903, i.e., just before the rising, addressed to General Maitland, in which the following passage occurs:—

"Captain Lloyd-Jones tells me from Sulek that the Kotaibis fired on a house in which the Alawi was staying on the night of the 26th, but did no damage. He also tells me that the Kotaibis are again restless because the Amir had promised to get permission for them to collect taxes once more, but now finds he is unable to carry out this engagement as you do not approve of such a course."

I have no doubt whatever of the accuracy of Captain Lloyd-Jones' information on this point, as it agrees with the result of my inquiries in the same direction.

The result is that we are endangering the peace of the country and the safety of the trade routes from a feeling of consideration for the Amir, as to a point on which he has himself never insisted, and on which, were we to withdraw, he would be the first to give way.

8. My proposals, then, are as follows:—

(1.) The suzerainty of the Amir having once been forced on the Kotaibis, although only in name, cannot now be dropped. It can, however, be minimized.

(2.) Mahomed Saleh to receive a monthly stipend of 50 dollars, his claim to the right of levying dues being in no way recognized, but in compensation for the loss of a source of income (about, I think, 100 dollars per mensem) which undoubtedly existed before our arrival and after it, i.e., till August 1903.

I would not, however, suggest that we bind ourselves to pay the stipend in perpetuity, but would word the clause to this effect:—

"So long as the stipend of 50 dollars per mensem is paid by Government, Mahomed Saleh* to engage not to raise the question of dues, nor to allow it to be raised on their behalf."

This suits our convenience, and if at any future date we wish to discontinue the stipend we can do so without any breach of faith; the Amir of Dthala can then, if he is able, compel Mahomed Saleh not to levy dues.

If he proves unable to do so, it supports my belief that our Treaty with the Amir in this direction is valueless to us, as it was with a view to the suppression of disorder on the road arising from the attempts of the Kotaibis to levy dues that this clause was mainly inserted.

Properly treated, I believe that the Kotaibis would prove to be our best friends in this part of the country, and that through Mahomed Saleh our difficulties in both Upper and Lower Yaffai in the future may be very greatly diminished.

9. If Mahomed Saleh is granted a stipend, some of the other Radfan tribes in the immediate neighbourhood of the direct road from Nobat to Dthala will also ask for stipends.

I propose that each be granted, terminable at our pleasure, to the following:—

						Per mensem.
						Dollars.
Hijaili	25
Dthambari	25
Bukri	20

I shall be glad if this matter can be settled at as early a date as can possibly be arranged, as I must meet Mahomed Saleh in the near future, and unless I can offer him the stipend I propose, I fear that serious trouble will sooner or later arise along the whole of the lines of communication from Nobat Dakim to Dthala.

The only possible alternative to my suggestion that I can see is to be continually prepared to send out a force to punish any tribes which may give trouble on the trade routes. This, from every point of view, is extremely undesirable, until at least we have tried the effects of the policy which I now propose.

Inclosure 5 in No. 133.

Government of Bombay to Major-General Mason.

(Telegraphic.)

Mahableshwar, November 21, 1904.

YOUR letter dated the 5th November. Treaty should be signed before Amir leaves Aden.

* And his heirs and successors.

Inclosure 6 in No. 133.

Government of Bombay to Major-General Mason.

(Confidential.)

Bombay Castle, November 25, 1904.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your Memorandum dated the 5th November, 1904, forwarding copy of a letter dated the 29th October, 1904, from Major W. Merewether, the Political Officer, Dthala, on the subject of a Treaty with the Amir of Dthala.

2. You have already been directed in my telegram dated the 21st November, 1904, to sign the Treaty; and I am now to communicate the observations which follow upon the report on the affairs of Dthala. Major Merewether's full report has had the careful attention of the Governor in Council. The considerations urged by the Political Officer are, in short, that the Amir of Dthala—

- (1.) Is unworthy of trust;
- (2.) Is unpopular with his people;
- (3.) Has no means of giving effect to the Treaty; and
- (4.) Has evaded former Treaty obligations.

Major Merewether further criticizes the policy of the past and points to the danger involved in what seems to him the mistake Government have made in treating the Kotaibi as subordinate to the Amir of Dthala.

3. It should be explained to the Political Officer that the Amir is, whatever his personal characteristic may be, the *de facto* head of the "tribesmen, subjects, and dependencies" of Dthala; and it is with him in that capacity, and so long as he is recognized as such, that the British Government have entered upon the Treaty. Our obligations under the Treaty hold so long as he fulfils his to our satisfaction, and if he is unable, in spite of Major Merewether's earnest co-operation with him, to fulfil them, or if he ceases to occupy the position in which Government deal with him, the Governor in Council will no longer be bound to pay the stipend.

4. I am to request that you will impress strongly upon Major Merewether the necessity for recognizing the existing situation in Arabia. The Amir of Dthala, like other Sheikhs, is the ruler recognized by his tribesmen, and must be recognized by us and treated by the Political Officer with due respect as such. The Political Officer seems disposed, on the strength of information which appears to emanate always from the same unspecified quarter, to draw the inference that the Amir is a man to be held at arms length and treated with suspicion. On the contrary, it would be well if, taking him as he is, Major Merewether would deal with him direct, thus gaining his confidence and paving the way to the exercise of that personal influence which is essential to our position in the Protectorate. The Political Officer is of course quite right to tap all sources of information, and the foregoing remarks apply to all Sheikhs of all tribes, including Mahomed Saleh of the Kotaibi, with all of whom it is important that the dealings should be direct and personal. Major Merewether seems indeed to have taken great pains to acquaint himself with the political situation, but the Governor in Council thinks it is advisable to caution him not to permit intelligence, implicating the Amir's good faith, to interfere with his continued dealings—friendly, direct, constant, and candid—with the Amir.

5. In conclusion, I am directed to point out how necessary it is to impress upon the Political Officer that he should not expect impossible standards of conduct from the Arab Chiefs. The inferences hostile to the Amir which Major Merewether draws date from the time of the Kaim Mukam's raid. The sources of his information are not clearly indicated; and upon these depend the value to be placed upon his conclusions. His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that the Resident and the Political Officer should accord every possible courtesy and consideration to these Chiefs, who after all are rulers to their own countrymen, and should endeavour to obtain as close a personal influence over them as is possible. An attitude on the part of the Political Officer towards the Chiefs similar to that adopted by the late Captain Warneford is essential. He must recognize their moral weaknesses, while according full respect to their local importance, and endeavour, by encouraging frequent and direct intercourse, to influence them for the prevention of trouble.

Inclosure 7 in No. 133.

*Government of Bombay to Government of India.**Bombay Castle, December 19, 1904.*

WITH reference to Foreign Department letter, dated the 17th October, 1904,* inclosing a copy of a despatch, dated the 23rd September, 1904,† from His Majesty's Secretary of State for India, approving of a draft of a revised Treaty with the Amir of Dthala, I am directed to forward herewith, in triplicate, for ratification by the Government of India, the new Treaty which was concluded with the Amir on the 28th November, 1904, and which embodies the modifications suggested by His Majesty's Secretary of State.

2. I am at the same time to inclose extract paragraph 2 of Major-General Mason's forwarding letter, dated the 3rd December, 1904, and to request that the Government of India may be moved to sanction, as recommended therein, the issue, free of payment, of twenty-five rifles to the Amir wherewith to arm twenty-five out of the fifty men referred to in Article IX of the Treaty.

Inclosure 8 in No. 133.

Major-General Mason to Government of Bombay.

Extract.)

Aden, December 3, 1904.

2. ON the Treaty being read out to the Amir, he complained that the proposed stipend of 100 dollars per mensem, and the further monthly subsidy of 100 dollars for the maintenance of a force of fifty men, were small compared with the responsibilities to be undertaken by him. He also demurred at first to the separation of the stipend and the subsidy. Eventually he agreed to the revised draft Treaty as approved by Government, but he pleaded that at least he should be given the rifles wherewith to arm the fifty men, and also two small cannons. The request for the latter I am not disposed to recommend, as it is not usual for Government to present the Chiefs with cannon. But as to the rifles, we might perhaps give the Amir half the number required, though considering the benefits he has reaped by the demarcation of the frontier and the enhanced stipend and additional subsidy now proposed to be given, he should not expect further assistance from Government.

Inclosure 9 in No. 133.

Treaty with the Amir of Dthala.

THE British Government and the Amir Shaif-bin-Sef-bin-Abdul Hadi-bin-Hasan, the Ruler of Dthala and all its dependencies, having determined to firmly establish the relations of peace and friendship so long existing between them.

The British Government have named and appointed Major-General Henry Macan Mason, Political Resident at Aden, to conclude a Treaty for this purpose.

The said Major-General Henry Macan Mason and the Amir Shaif-bin-Sef-bin-Abdul Hadi-bin-Hasan aforesaid have agreed upon and concluded the following Articles:—

I.

There shall be peace and friendship between the British Government and all the tribesmen, subjects, and dependents of the Amir of Dthala. The subjects of the British and the people of Dthala and its dependencies shall be free to enter the territories of the other; they shall not be molested, but shall be treated with respect at all times and at all places. The said Amir of Dthala and other notable persons shall visit Aden when they please. They shall be treated with respect, and be given passes to carry arms.

* In India Office of November 1904.

† Ibid.

II.

In compliance with the wish of the aforesaid Amir Shaif-bin-Sef-bin Abdul Hadi-bin-Hasan, the British Government hereby undertake to extend the territory of Dthala and all its dependencies the gracious favour and protection of His Majesty the King, Emperor.

III.

The said Amir Shaif-bin-Sef-bin Abdul Hadi-bin-Hasan hereby agrees, and promises on behalf of himself, his heirs, and successors, and the whole of the tribesmen, subjects, and dependents under his jurisdiction, to refrain from entering into any correspondence, agreement, or Treaty with any foreign nation or Power; and further promises to give immediate notice to the Resident at Aden or other British officer of any attempt by any other Power to interfere with the territory of Dthala or any of its dependencies.

IV.

The said Amir Shaif-bin-Sef-bin Abdul Hadi-bin-Hasan hereby binds himself, and his heirs and successors for ever, that they will not cede, sell, mortgage, lease, hire, or give, or otherwise dispose of the territory of Dthala and its dependencies, or any other part of the same, at any time to any Power other than the British Government.

V.

The said Amir Shaif-bin-Sef-bin Abdul Hadi-bin-Hasan further promises on behalf of himself, his heirs, and successors, and all his tribesmen, subjects, and dependents, that he will keep open the roads in the territory of Dthala and its dependencies, and that they will protect all persons who may be going in the direction of Aden for the purposes of trade, or returning therefrom.

VI.

The said Amir Shaif-bin-Sef-bin Abdul Hadi-bin-Hasan also engages, on behalf of himself, his heirs, and successors, and all his tribesmen, subjects, and dependents, to maintain the boundary which has been demarcated by the joint British and Turkish Commission, and to protect the boundary pillars.

VII.

Further, the said Amir Shaif-bin-Sef-bin Abdul Hadi-bin-Hasan undertakes, on behalf of himself, his heirs, and successors, to maintain order within the boundary of the territories of Dthala and its dependencies, and to restrain his tribesmen, subjects, and dependents from creating disturbances either in his own territory or in the country beyond the boundary-line, and from interfering with the tribes who are subjects of the Turkish Government.

VIII.

In consideration of these undertakings and engagements, the British Government agree to pay to the said Amir Shaif-bin-Sef-bin Abdul Hadi-bin-Hasan, and to his successor or successors, a monthly sum of 100 dollars, the half of which is 50 dollars.

IX.

To assist him in carrying out the obligations imposed by this Treaty, the said Amir, on behalf of himself and his successors, engages to maintain a force of fifty men, or such less number as the Resident may agree to. So long as this force is

maintained in a state of efficiency to the satisfaction of the Resident, the British Government agree to pay to the said Amir Shaif-bin-Sef-bin Abdul Hadi-bin-Hasan, and to his successor or successors, a monthly sum of 100 dollars, the half of which is 50 dollars—this subsidy to be in addition to that mentioned in Article VIII.

X.

The above Treaty shall have effect from this date. In witness thereof the Undersigned have affixed their signatures or seals at Aden this 28th day of November, 1904.

(Signed) H. M. MASON, *Major-General,*
Resident in Aden.

Witnesses:
(Signed) J. DAVIS, *Lieutenant-Colonel,*
First Assistant-Resident in Aden.
ALI JAFFAR, *Head Interpreter.*

(Signed) CURZON,
Viceroy and Governor-General of India.

This Treaty was ratified by the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council at Fort William on the 8th day of February, A.D. 1905.

(Signed) S. M. FRASER,
Officiating Secretary to the Government of India
in the Foreign Department.

Inclosure 10 in No. 133.

Government of India to Government of Bombay.

Sir,

Fort William, February 27, 1905.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letters relating to the revised Treaty which was concluded with the Amir of Dthala on the 28th November, 1904.

2. The Treaty has been ratified by the Viceroy and Governor-General in Council, and two out of the three counterparts received are returned herewith, one for delivery to the Amir, and the other for record by the Government of Bombay. The third has been retained for deposit in the archives of the Foreign Department of the Government of India.

3. With reference to paragraph 2 of the second of your letters under acknowledgment, I am to convey sanction to the issue, free of payment, of twenty-five rifles to the Amir.

I have, &c.
(Signed) C. SOMERS COCKS,
Assistant Secretary to the Government of India.

Inclosure 11 in No. 133.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Secret.)

My Lord,

India Office, April 14, 1905.

I HAVE received and considered your Excellency's despatch, Secret, dated the 9th March, inclosing with other papers an interesting and important Report by Major Merewether, dated the 29th October, 1904. I observe that the Political Officer at Dthala, in the Report just mentioned, recommends the grant of a stipend to Mahomed Saleh, Sheikh of the Kotaibis, upon his undertaking not to raise the question of dues levied by that tribe on the Haberlain, and also certain temporary stipends to the Radfan tribes. I shall be glad to receive an expression of the views of your Government upon these proposals.

I have, &c.
(Signed) ST. JOHN BRODRICK.

No. 134.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 19.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 23rd ultimo, relative to Abu Musa Island.

India Office, April 18, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 134.

Extract from the Diary of the Persian Gulf Political Residency for the week ending February 19, 1905.

Bushire, February 10.—The Resident recently asked the Residency Agent on the Arab Coast to warn the Chief of Shargah and his uncle, Sheikh Salem, against entering into any agreement with M. R. Wonckhaus, of the German trading firm, for leasing the red oxide mines on Abu Musa. The Agent now reports that the Sheikhs have assured him that they will do nothing without the Resident's knowledge.

No. 135.

Telegram from Turkish Commandant at Bagdad.—(Communicated by Musurus Pasha, April 19, 1905.)

BAHREIN, situé en face du district de Koutir, dans le Sandjak de Nedjd, fait partie de l'Empire Ottoman. Néanmoins, le Gouvernement Britannique a conclu avec des Cheikhs de ce territoire des Arrangements en vertu desquels il a promis de les protéger, ainsi que leurs navires, à la condition qu'ils lui céderont le tiers du produit de la pêche. En ces derniers temps un bâtiment Anglais est arrivé à Bahrein à l'occasion de l'incident survenu entre un Européen et les hommes d'Ali, neveu du Cheikh Issa, fils du Khalifa Hakim, de ladite localité; l'autorité à bord a réprimandé, en usant de violence, les présumés coupables et les a obligés de payer une amende de 4,000 roupies. Tout récemment les Anglais ont amené un bateau spécial pour draguer le long des côtes et faciliter ainsi à leurs navires l'accès du pays. Ils ont demandé, en outre, qu'on leur livrât Ali, fils d'Ahmed, et Béni Mehzi Namani, qui s'étaient réfugiés chez Djaneissani, Caïmacan et Cheikh de Koutir.

Comme le Cheikh Issa a refusé de livrer ces derniers, ils ont emprisonné le fils du Cheikh et le juge lui-même, à bord d'un bâtiment de guerre, ont démoli la maison du réfugié Ali-bin-Ahmed, mis le feu à ses meubles et envoya en cadeau les objets précieux qu'il possédait, ses chevaux et ses navires, au Cheikh Moubareck à Kuweit. Comme celui-ci ne les a pas acceptés, on les a vendus au marché de cette ville. Ils ont occupé militairement la ville de Ménamet, capitale de Bahrein, et prenant possession des Douanes, ils ont procédé à la perception des droits de pêche.

A la suite de cet incident, le Cheikh Issa, qui prétendait être indépendant, se déclare maintenant sujet de l'Empire Ottoman. Bien que le Gouvernement Britannique déclare considérer indépendant le susdit Cheikh, il a pris possession des Douanes et occupe militairement le pays.

No. 136.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, April 19, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th instant, forwarding a despatch from the Government of India, in which proposals are made for further action by His Majesty's Government with a view to obtaining the evacuation of Bubián Island by the Turkish troops now stationed there.

In reply I am to inclose, for the information of the Secretary of State for India, copies of a despatch from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople,* touching upon this question, and of Lord Lansdowne's reply,† which had been sent before your letter of the 11th instant was received.

Mr. Brodrick will observe that Lord Lansdowne has indicated the expediency of action practically identical with that suggested in the despatch from the Government of India. In view, however, of the fact that the Aden frontier question was not yet finally settled, His Lordship thought it desirable to give his Excellency full discretion as to making a representation immediately or deferring it for the moment, and he would prefer to await the Ambassador's opinion on this point before sending definite instructions.

A copy of your letter will be sent to Sir N. O'Connor by the first opportunity.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GORST.

No. 137.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 21.)

(No. 72.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, April 21, 1905.

WITH reference to your telegram No. 46 of the 17th instant respecting the Aden frontier delimitation, this morning I received a telegram marked No. 13 as follows:—

"Your telegram No. 16 of the 18th April, repeating to me the telegram from the Government of India. To-day the *procès-verbal* to the following effect was signed by Ottoman Commissioner—

"In the first place, the territory to the north of and adjoining the Murad boundary line has lien on it. In general the true north-east line up to the desert forms the basis of the north-east demarcation.

"Yaffai to have Nawa Rubeaten Dabiani. Finally, we are to have Aulaki as well as all its dependencies and subdivisions.

"In view of the fact that suzerainty over Behan-al-Kasab is claimed by Aulaki, Beda is the only serious gap. But as is shown on map inclosed in our No. 333 of the 1st October, 1903, it lies mainly south of true north-east line.

"I shall proceed to Aden to hand over to the Resident, and thence return to Constantinople as soon as the pillars are erected, the sixty miles of the Subaihi frontier being also satisfactorily settled and signed."

No. 138.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received April 22.)

Sir,

India Office, April 19, 1905.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant, regarding the Aden boundary delimitation, and to acquaint you, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that Mr. Secretary Brodrick concurs in the Marquess of Lansdowne's proposal to approve the action taken by Sir N. O'Connor, as reported in his despatch No. 223, dated the 4th instant, in connection with two new points raised by Mr. Fitzmaurice, upon which it appeared to his Excellency unnecessary to insist.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

* No. 94.

[1517]

† No. 114.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 50.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, April 23, 1905.

PLEASE convey to Mr. Fitzmaurice my entire approval. His report has been received with great satisfaction, and your views as to his conduct of the negotiations, as reported in your telegram No. 72 of the 21st instant, are entirely shared by His Majesty's Government.

Sir A. Hardinge to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 24.)

(No. 57. Confidential.)

My Lord,

[Tehran, March 16, 1905.]

I HAVE the honour to report in continuation of my telegram No. 33 of to-day's date, that on receipt of your Lordship's latest instructions respecting the status of Koweit Arabs in Persia, I spoke on this subject to M. Naus. His Excellency informed me that the orders telegraphed by his Department to the Belgian Customs officials in the Persian Gulf, of which he gave me in confidence the inclosed copy, had been issued by the desire of the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, with whom he advised me to discuss them.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh stated, in reply to my inquiries, that his own action was the result of a protest made by the Turkish Consulate at Bushire against the acquiescence of the Persian Government in the intervention of His Majesty's Residency on behalf of a native of Koweit. I may mention that the Arab concerned was a pilot employed on a British India steamer, and that when the case, which, so far as I recollect, was one of assault, arose I prevailed on the Persian Foreign Office to instruct the Bushire authorities to allow Major Cox' intervention and exclude that of the Turkish Consul, by pointing out that the former might be justified, without raising the political question, on the ground of the Koweit Arab's being a sailor on a British ship. As a consequence of this Turkish protest, the Persian Government had made inquiries by the Shah's commands of its Embassy at Constantinople, and the latter had reported that the Sublime Porte objected to natives of Koweit being treated in Persia otherwise than as Ottoman subjects. The Mushir-ed-Dowleh added that they had always been so treated in the past, that is to say, they had been subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the Persian tribunals and authorities, as neither Persia nor Turkey grant extraterritorial rights to the subjects of the other within their respective territories, but the intervention and representations of the Turkish Embassy and Consuls on their behalf had been recognized in all extra-judicial matters in which they had complaints against the Persian authorities or Persian subjects. This, it should be noted, puts Koweitis in a position different from that of Afghans, who, having no regular Treaty or diplomatic relations with Persia, are treated, except in so far as "our good offices" are allowed on their behalf, on the same footing as natives of Persia.

I explained to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that in our view Koweit was *de facto* independent of Turkey, which had not established or maintained an effective control over the country, although the Sheikh recognized in common with most orthodox Sunnis outside Africa the religious authority of the Sultan as Caliph, and was, moreover, the owner of large estates in the Vilayet of Bussorah. On these latter grounds the Turkish Government, I believe, claimed him as its subject, much as it asserted, without enforcing it, a claim to sovereignty over many other Chiefs in Arabia such as the Sheikh of Bahrein and the Amir of Nejd. Sheikh Mubarak Ibn Sabah, however, repudiated this claim, and had entered into certain arrangements with His Majesty's Government bearing some resemblance to those made by us with other Arab Chiefs in the Persian Gulf, in virtue of which we had undertaken to extend our good offices to his subjects, when outside Koweit. If the Persian Government recognized, as they seemed to have done in their instructions to M. Waffalaert, that Koweit was politically separate from and independent of Turkey, would there be any objection to allowing the Sheikh to intrust the protection of his subjects in Persia to His Majesty's Representatives, much as Swiss citizens were protected by the French Legation, or at least to recognizing such a limited intervention by us on their behalf, as we exercised under a "dastkhat" of the late Shah in the case of Afghans?

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh asked what view would be taken of such a claim by us on behalf of Koweit subjects (1) in Turkey; (2) in other foreign States. Would the French Consul at Bushire, for example, admit the intervention of the Residency in a suit between a French citizen and a native of Koweit?

I said I felt certain that in Turkey the Turkish authorities would insist on treating Koweitis as Ottoman subjects. This, however, proved nothing, as they put forward the same claim in the case of Tunisians and Algerines (or at least used to do when I was at Constantinople), notwithstanding the fact that Tunis had been a French Protectorate for a quarter of a century, and Algiers a French possession for sixty years. As regards other foreign Powers, I was not aware that any opportunity had arisen for any discussion with them on the question, Koweit having no intercourse with any States except those on the shores of the Persian Gulf. If such a case as he had supposed, for the sake of argument, were to arise with the French, the French Consul would either admit our intervention or an exchange of views would follow on the political issues at stake, similar to that now taking place between his Excellency and myself. I have since sent his Excellency a French geographical work, based on Elisée Reclus' "Géographie Universelle," which, whilst describing Bahrein as a Turkish dependency, includes Koweit among the States of "independent Arabia."

His Excellency observed that it was somewhat remarkable that no such test case as he had suggested should as yet have arisen, and that we should now for the first time last year have had occasion to intervene on behalf of Koweitis. I said this seemed to me quite intelligible, as it was only within quite a recent period that Europeans other than Englishmen, had concerned themselves with the trade or politics of the Persian Gulf, or that an European Customs Administration, with its strict and precise procedure, had raised questions which in the days of the old farmers had been left to be dealt with in a much more irregular and haphazard fashion. The strict repression of the traffic in arms, in connection with which the Sheikh had complained to us of the harsh treatment of Koweit dhows by the Persian authorities, was moreover a comparatively modern feature.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh said he could not give me an answer off hand as to the view which the Persian Government would take of my proposal, but that he would submit the whole question, which would require rather careful consideration, to the Shah, and I think it not improbable that he may consult, not the Russians, but one or two representatives less decidedly identified with opposition to our interests in the Gulf, such as those of France and Germany, before giving me a definite answer. From a Persian point of view, it is probably more desirable that Koweit subjects oppressed or robbed by the Persian authorities should be under the lethargic protection of Turkey rather than the strenuous care of a British Resident, and the Persian Government certainly regards Turkish influence in the Gulf with much less fear and distrust than it does ours. This last consideration may, however, induce it, out of prudence, to lean rather to our view than to that of Turkey, and while I think that it will hesitate for a long time to commit itself on one side or the other, I am not without hope that a working understanding may be arrived at, especially if we can get the Persians to admit, which they seem inclined to do, that Koweit is *de facto* independent.

I told the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that I thought it would be to Persia's interest to maintain good relations with Koweit, as the Sheikh was on friendly terms with the Ibn Saud dynasty, which had apparently re-established its authority over the greater part of Nejd, and thus controlled the overland Persian pilgrim route from the holy cities of Irak Arabi to Medina. Koweit was, moreover, becoming every year an increasingly important commercial centre, and it would be to the advantage of the Persian Government to secure friendly treatment for Persian subjects proceeding there for trade or travelling as pilgrims across Jebel Shammar and Nejd, by a conciliatory attitude towards the political views of the Sheikh, and the commercial interests of his subjects visiting Persia. His Excellency made a note of this last observation, and repeated that my representations would receive the most careful attention.

I have sent him the inclosed written reminder of our conversation, but have thought it better to avoid formulating in writing any views about the status of Koweit.

I have, &c.

(Signed) ARTHUR H. HARDINGE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 140.

Instructions issued by M. Naus to Belgian Customs Officials in Persian Gulf.

(Télégraphique.)

Le 10 Mars, 1905.

(a.) SUITE rapport 29 Octobre.

Vous devez, par ordre Ministère Affaires Étrangères, vous refuser correspondre avec Consul Anglais au sujet affaires concernant habitants Koweit. S'il insiste encore, écrivez-lui officiellement de s'adresser par intermédiaire Légation au Ministère des Affaires Étrangères à Téhéran.

(b.) Copie procès-verbal concernant habitants Koweitne doivent être communiquée ni Consul Anglais ni Consul Turc.

Inclosure 2 in No. 140.

Sir A. Hardinge to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Your Excellency,

Tehran, March 16, 1905.

I HAVE not thought it necessary to trouble your Excellency with a recapitulation of our conversation of yesterday's date respecting the status of Koweit Arabs in Persia, but I would beg to remind your Excellency of your promise to consider the points which I had the honour to submit to you on that occasion, and to ask you at your earliest convenience to give me a reply on them for transmission to His Majesty's Government.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) ARTHUR H. HARDINGE

No. 141.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 24.)

(No. 248. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, April 17, 1905.

IN obedience to the instructions contained in your Lordship's despatch No. 114 of the 11th instant, I have the honour to report as follows:—

As I anticipated that the Porte would be likely, upon my return here, to complain of the retention of the British Resident at Koweit, I asked His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah to let me know whether the Turkish military station still existed on Bubian Island. Mr. Monahan replied that it did, and that there were eight soldiers and one sergeant still there.

The Porte did not, however, mention the matter to me; but, had they done so, I should have replied that, so long as they kept their soldiers on the island, contrary to the previously existing state of things, they had no right to make objections about Major Knox's appointment, nor could I discuss the question with them.

On my side, I thought it best not to make fresh representations, at all events at present, about the guard house, fearing that if I did so they might propose a bargain, and suggest that we should withdraw our Resident, and they the soldiers. I do not think this would suit us, and I should be sorry to see His Majesty's Government renounce their right to send a Resident to Koweit, as, in the existing condition of affairs, some outward sign of our predominant position at Koweit seems highly desirable.

But, apart from these considerations, and supposing that the Porte did not make such a proposal, I thought that my representations would fail to have effect unless His Majesty's Government were resolved either to induce the Sheikh of Koweit to establish a military station at the other end of the island—a step which, taking into account the shifty character and double dealings of his Highness, might require considerable persuasion—or to insist upon the removal of the Turks.

I venture to think that, while the Turkish military station is maintained on Bubian Island, we can properly refuse to give any definite assurances respecting the presence of a British Resident at Koweit, and that even if Major Knox be now withdrawn in accordance with your Lordship's assurances to Musurus Pasha, he should return at an

early date. Gradually his appointment will be regarded by the Turks as a *fait accompli*, and their refusal to withdraw their soldiers from Bubian Island will enable His Majesty's Government to consider whether at some future date it may not be advisable to check the Ottoman Government by establishing a Koweit military station on Bubian Island.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 142.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 24.)

(No. 252.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, April 18, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 214 of the 4th instant and to previous correspondence respecting the movements of Turkish troops, I have the honour to report that, in addition to the 3,500 sent off a month ago, 2,050 left Trebizond and Samsoun for Salonica on the 6th and 7th instant. Orders have been received at Trebizond for the mobilization of the Redifs to serve as reinforcements for the Yemen. Eight battalions have been called out forming the 53rd and 54th Regiments, 27th Brigade, 14th Division of the 4th Army Corps. Great difficulty is experienced in collecting the men, as the mortality in Arabia was so great that no less than half the troops returned to their homes.

Mr. Millelire reports, in a despatch from Janina, of which I inclose a copy, that the mobilization of the 17th Redif Brigade, which is to take the place of the Nizam troops destined for the Yemen, is not proceeding satisfactorily. At Argyrocastro, Janina, and Lescovic only a comparatively small number of men have responded to the call, and of 300 men who were dispatched to Metzovo a considerable number are said to have deserted on the way.

The 2nd battalion and two companies of the 1st battalion of the 21st Regiment of Nizams have embarked at Prevesa for the Yemen.

The prevalent opinion here is that things are going very badly in the Yemen and that the Imperial troops are in sore straits. The Porte refuses, however, either to deny or confirm the news sent by His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida, of which copy was forwarded to your Lordship in my despatch No. 241 of the 15th instant; but if they had been able to deny it, the presumption is that they would not have hesitated to do so.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 142.

Acting Vice-Consul Millelire to Consul-General Graves.

(No. 11.)

M. le Consul-Général,

Janina, le 5 Avril, 1905.

L'APPEL sous les armes des Redifs de ce vilayet s'accomplit d'une manière toute laborieuse.

A Argyrocastro, on est parvenu à grande peine à réunir 300 hommes à peu près. Les Argyrocastrites sont fort mécontents et excités contre ce Vali, pour la question des Bektachis et déclarent ouvertement que tant que le Sultan laissera Osman Pacha à Janina, ils ne donneront aucun appui à son Gouvernement. A peine appelés sous les armes, les Argyrocastrites présentèrent la question des arriérés qui leur sont dus de l'année dernière, disant qu'ils ne se rendraient pas sous le drapeau avant d'avoir reçu leur argent jusqu'au dernier sou. Le Gouvernement les paya sans retard, mais malgré cela, comme dis-je plus haut, 300 à peu près prirent les armes, et les autres, sans se soucier de rien, retournèrent chez eux. Ces 300 arrivèrent l'autre jour dans notre ville, et furent immédiatement envoyés à Metzovo; durant le trajet bon nombre d'eux désertèrent avec armes et bagage.

Il paraît que l'autorité militaire ait pris d'autres dispositions sur la destination

des bataillons des Redifs, en créant un système mixte de compagnies, mais jusqu'à présent rien n'a été décidé.

Les 200 Redifs du bataillon de Janina, réunis dans notre ville et déjà partis pour Philippiades, firent comme ceux d'Argyrocastro : prétendirent et obtinrent les arrières, et un certain nombre d'entre eux retournèrent dans leurs villages à Lescovic ; malgré tous les efforts de l'autorité, cinquante personnes à peine se présentèrent à l'appel. A Premeti, personne ne fit acte de présence. A Vallona, du peu de Redifs qui s'étaient réunis, le Gouvernement, pour leur éviter la fatigue de se rendre à pied à Prevesa, avait voulu les envoyer par mer à bord d'un bateau de la Mahsoussa, mais les Valloniotes, fourbes comme des Albanais qu'ils sont, dans la peur d'être dirigés pour le Yémen, répondirent que, n'étant pas habitués à la mer, ils préférèrent se rendre par terre à Prevesa. Cependant, jusqu'à présent personne n'est encore arrivée.

Il n'est pas encore possible de faire des pronostics, mais tout fait voir que la population Mussulmane est fort mécontente et lasse de cet état de choses, et si la mobilisation entière des six bataillons des Redifs aura lieu, ce sera le fruit d'un travail lent et laborieux.

A Prevesa arrivèrent quatre bateaux de la Mahsoussa, deux desquels embarquèrent le second bataillon et deux compagnies du premier bataillon du 21^e Régiment de Nizams, et partirent pour le Yémen ; les deux autres bateaux attendront l'arrivée des autres bataillons.

Veuillez, &c.
(Signé) E. MILLELIRE.

No. 143.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 26.)

(No. 258.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, April 18, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 179 of the 21st ultimo, reporting that reforms in the administration of the Yemen were under contemplation, I have the honour to state that I now learn that the Council of Ministers have drawn up a report dealing with the despatch of a Reform Commission to the Yemen, and with proposals for its division into four vilayets, the formation of an Army Corps, and of a police and gendarmerie force of natives of the province.

Shakir Pasha, now Vali of Uscub, has been appointed President of the Commission. He has an excellent record during his tenure of that post, and also while he held a similar position at Scutari in Albania, and his departure is much to be regretted.

The other members of the Commission are—Mehmed Reschid Pasha, ex-Mutessarif of Moush, civil member ; Kemal Effendi, Naib of Sana'a, religious member ; and Ali Amiri Effendi, ex-Defterdar of Aleppo, financial member. The Commission is to study such questions as the opening of schools, the building of roads, the development of agriculture, and the recruiting of an Army Corps and of a gendarmerie force from amongst the native population, and is authorized to correspond with the various Ministers on these subjects.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 144.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 26.)

(No. 259.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, April 18, 1905.

WITH reference to my immediately preceding despatch, in which I reported that Shakir Pasha, the Vali of Kossovo, has been appointed President of the Commission of Reforms for the Yemen, I have the honour to state that Mahmoud Shefkeh Pasha, a member of the Committee of Experiments at the arsenal of Tophane, has been selected

to succeed him. Mahmoud Shefket is a very little-known official, and I have not yet been able to learn much as to his character and antecedents.

His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Uscub considers that the removal of Shakir Pasha is much to be regretted, but I do not think that this is a case in which it would be possible for me to interfere to obtain his retention.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 145.

M. Geoffray to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 28.)

M. le Marquis,

Ambassade de France, Londres, le 26 Avril, 1905.

EN constatant, par sa lettre du 22 Mars à son Excellence M. Cambon, que les Gouvernements Anglais et Français s'étaient mis d'accord pour admettre l'emploi simultané des langues Anglaise et Française, par le Tribunal de La Haye dans l'arbitrage Mascatais, votre Seigneurie a proposé que cette décision soit notifiée de concert par les deux Gouvernements au Tribunal Arbitral. Elle a demandé en même temps si cette manière d'agir conviendrait au Gouvernement de la République.

Je suis chargé par mon Gouvernement de faire savoir à votre Seigneurie qu'il ne voit que des avantages à ce qu'il soit ainsi procédé. Il estime, d'ailleurs, que le Bureau International de la Cour de La Haye devrait être pris comme intermédiaire de la notification à faire aux Arbitres des dispositions des deux Parties.

Veuillez, &c.
(Signé) GEOFFRAY.

No. 146.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received April 28.)

(No. 76.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, April 28, 1905.

REBELLION in the Yemen.

General situation is critical, Syrian troops being in state of mutiny. Sanaa has surrendered to Iman and Menakha has been invested.

No. 147.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir H. Howard.

(No. 33.)

Sir

Foreign Office, April 28, 1905.

I TRANSMIT to you herewith ten copies of the Counter-Case on behalf of His Majesty's Government in the pending arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Muscat dhows.*

One of these copies should be retained for your information, and the remainder communicated on the 1st May to the Permanent Bureau. Of these nine copies, five are intended for the use of the French Government, one for the archives of the Bureau, and the remaining three for transmission respectively to each of the two Arbitrators and to the Umpire when appointed.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

* Muscat Counter-Case.

No. 148.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir H. Howard.

(No. 31.)

Foreign Office, April 29, 1905.

Sir,

I TRANSMIT herewith certified copies of correspondence, as marked in the margin,* with the French Ambassador at this Court in regard to an objection raised by the French Government to the introduction of the name of the Sultan of Muscat in the British Case as one of the parties in the Muscat Dhow Arbitration.

I request that you will communicate the papers to the Permanent Bureau at The Hague. Four copies of each document are inclosed, and are intended, one for each of the two Arbitrators, one for the Umpire when appointed, and the fourth for the archives of the Permanent Bureau.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

* See Part I, No. 75; and *ante*, Nos. 39, 82, and 122.

CONFIDENTIAL.

(8482.)

PART II.

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

AFFAIRS OF ARABIA.

March and April 1905.